University of Alberta

Envisioning cities:
Making municipal cultural policy in Canada

by

Donna Laverne Cardinal ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

in

Canadian Studies
Department of Political Science

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 1999

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-46966-2

Canadä

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Donna Laverne Cardinal

Title of Thesis: Envisioning cities: Making municipal cultural policy in Canada

Degree: Master of Arts

Year this Degree Granted: 1999

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

9120 - 64 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T6E 0H7

August 30, 1999

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled: **Envisioning Cities: Making Municipal Cultural Policy in Canada** submitted by **Donna Laverne Cardinal** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS in Canadian Studies.

David J. Whitson
Dr. David Whitson (Supervisor)

Judith A. Garber
Dr. Judith Garber (Chair)

Judith Golec
Dr. Judith Golec (External Member)

Aug. 23, 1999
Date

For Warren Ziegler

who has helped me to discover the work
to which my spirit calls me.

Abstract

The emergence of culture onto the public policy agenda at the municipal level in English Canada is documented briefly. A review of five cultural policy enquiries conducted in English-speaking urban centres during the 1990s reveals a typical approach to public policy-making for culture in Canadian municipalities. Envisioning is offered as an alternative cultural policy process at the municipal level. Two case studies document the envisioning approach applied to local cultural policy-making: the Edmonton Cultural Futures Project in 1988, and the Kitchener CulturePlan project in 1995-96. Conclusions are drawn about the potential of envisioning to address concerns with public policy-making being raised by Bianchini (1993), Carlsson (1996), Magnusson (1996), Phillips (1991), and Stevenson (1998).

Acknowledgements

My graduate studies were prompted by questions arising within me during two cultural policy projects with which I was directly involved: Edmonton's Cultural Futures Project and Kitchener's CulturePlan. In these projects, I glimpsed a possibility that the policy-making process itself might facilitate cultural development, rather than being a means to that end.

I am grateful to the participants in the two projects for the privilege of working with them on envisioning their cultural futures, and hope they will consider me to have treated their work with the respect it deserves. Their images remain with me and I delight to learn of actions they have taken and are taking even now to realize their visions individually and collectively.

In addition to giving outstanding leadership in their respective projects, Terry MacDougall, citizen chair of the Cultural Futures Project, and Mike Price, staff liaison to the Kitchener CulturePlan, read sections of the manuscript and offered helpful suggestions and thoughtful critique.

For encouragement and challenge in equal measure, I thank members of my examining committee Judith Garber and Judith Golec, and my faculty supervisor, David Whitson.

I appreciate the very practical contributions made by Allan Sheppard in editing the manuscript and Susan Sharpe in graciously proofreading it. Responsibility for any errors is mine alone.

One cannot be an effective facilitator of envisioning apart from being an envisioner oneself. I am deeply grateful to my Edmonton envisioning colleagues, in community with whom I have the ongoing opportunity to deepen and extend my competence in envisioning: Paul Burke, Lori Clapp, Wes Denison, Valerie Kennedy, and Terryl Miseck.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction 1

- Methodology 4
- Setting the Context 8
- Writing the Case Studies 9
- Defining Culture and the Arts 11

Chapter 2 Current State of Municipal Cultural Policy in Canada 15

- Resolution of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities 16
- Policy Report by the Toronto Arts Council 18
- Arts and the Cities/Les arts et la ville 21
- Canadian Conference of the Arts, Take Two 23
- The Bovey Report 24
- Shifting Government Expenditure Patterns 25
- Increased Attention to Policy Production 28
- Recent Examples of Municipal Cultural Policy 30
- Vancouver 31
- Edmonton 34
- Calgary 38
- Greater Vancouver 41
- Toronto: A Distinct Issue and a Distinct Approach 43
- CultureForce 47
- Conclusions 48

Chapter 3 Changing Purposes and Processes of Public Policy 49
The Politicization of Culture 53
Culture in the Service of Economic Goals 56
A Rereading of Five Urban Cultural Policies 59
A Fourth Phase of Cultural Policy? 65
Cultural Planning as a Policy Approach 69
The Canadian Experience 72
A Nonhierarchical Approach to Implementation Analysis 76
Cities and Political Space 80

Chapter 4 Envisioning 84
The Envisioning Questions 85
The Envisioning Practices 87
Principles Undergirding Envisioning 93
Varieties of Formats and Contexts 98
Projects: A Specific Application of Envisioning 101
Envisioning Policy Projects 103
Four Features Distinguishing Envisioning as a Public Policy Process 106

Chapter 5 The Cultural Futures Project, Edmonton 108
Background to the Project 108
A Process for Developing Cultural Policy 111
Inviting Participation 114
Generating Images of Edmonton's Cultural Futures 118

Forming Scenario Teams 122

Action Planning 125

First Community Consultation 128

Taking Action in the Present 129

Priority Trade-Off Matrix 131

Report Preparation 134

Future and Present in Tension 137

Council Action 144

Administrative Review 147

Nurturing Neighbourhoods 151

Conclusions 153

Chapter 6 Kitchener CulturePlan 156

Envisioning Culture in Kitchener 160

Inviting Participation 161

"Who's Playing Here!" 164

Building Community 168

Celebrating Community 171

From Envisioning to Draft Policy 173

Proposals for Strengthening Culture in Kitchener 177

Citizen Action 181

Council Action 183

The Treasure Chest 185

Outcomes 187

Conclusions 189

Chapter 7 Envisioning Canadian Cities:
An Alternative Cultural Policy Process 192
- Who Participates in Policy Production? And Who Decides? 193
- Who Defines the Issues for Policy? 198
- The Process for Arriving at Policy Proposals 202
- Policy Implementation 210
- Not Policy at All? 214
- Envisioning as Creating Political Space 216
- Cities, Citizenship, and Cultural Policy 218

Notes 222
References 227
Curriculum Vitae 236

Chapter 1

Introduction

About ten years ago, in 1987, I came across an approach to the future, or to planning, called envisioning. Envisioning had been developed by Warren Ziegler of The Futures-Invention Associates, Denver, Colorado. I attended a three-day workshop he gave for adult educators through Continuing Education at the University of Alberta. The practices and protocols he offered enabled me to explore some concerns I held, to imagine these concerns well addressed, and to find other people with whom to build a shared vision of the future. More important than the particular focus of my envisioning, though, was my immediate recognition that Ziegler's envisioning practices were powerful, liberating, and fruitful for me. I began applying envisioning practices and principles to personal and work concerns. Within a few months, I had opportunity to recommend envisioning as an approach to developing cultural policy for the City of Edmonton, my employer at the time. In the year-long Cultural Futures Project, designed and led by Ziegler, I experienced the application of envisioning to public policy. I continued to envision with groups of people in workshop or project settings, eventually making this my full-time work. Recently I had an opportunity to complete another municipal cultural policy project using envisioning: the Kitchener CulturePlan. The Edmonton and

Kitchener projects, bracketing a decade of envisioning work and sharing a focus on municipal cultural policy, offer an opportunity for me to reflect on the conjoining of these two major interests.

Unlike my discovery of envisioning, my awareness of cultural policy was gradual. Despite growing up poor in a rural community, I had early and sustained exposure to and involvement in the arts through dance and music lessons as a child and through extra curricular drama opportunities in junior and senior high school. I excelled at dance and at drama, as well as at academic subjects. In university, I studied drama and English, and went on to teach both in a small Okanagan town with a very active arts community. There I discovered both volunteering and community (we hadn't called them that on the farm), and became active in the voluntary, community-building activities of the local and regional community arts councils. These were my first experiences of community leadership and citizen action, as well as my first involvement in the emerging occupation of arts administration. After relocating to Edmonton, I made arts management and arts management education the focus of my professional life. In addition to paid work, I contributed at the provincial level and national levels to improving arts management education and strengthening board governance of voluntary not-for-profit organizations. In all of these endeavours--arts manager, board member, citizen activist, cultural bureaucrat, arts management educator, board trainer--I pondered the nexus of vision, leadership, citizen action and public policy. The specific questions that brought me to the envisioning workshop in 1987 were about vision: What is it? How do I come to it? and What contribution does it make to leadership in the public arena? I was not interested in these questions in the abstract. I believed they would help me and the citizens I worked with as we struggled to understand our concerns and bring about change.

While formulating and administering cultural policy, I was reflecting on my work through teaching (in the Canadian Studies program at the University of Alberta) and writing (papers on municipal cultural policy in Canada and on envisioning as an approach to making cultural policy). Reflecting merged with action when I accepted an invitation to direct the Cultural Leadership Development Project for the University of Waterloo using envisioning to develop innovative distance learning opportunities for cultural leaders in Canada. This three-year national project involved 350 self-designated cultural leaders in an exploration of vision, leadership, citizen action, and the contributions of envisioning thereto.[1] In this project, I experienced the power of envisioning to generate self-organizing groups of concerned and acting citizens even at a distance. Wanting to understand what it was about envisioning that enabled these outcomes and also wanting for the first time to understand the processes by which citizens make decisions together, I decided to enter a program of formal study in order to reflect upon my experiences. The Canadian Studies program at the University of Alberta provided a hospitable setting for this reflection. With guidance from professors in Business, Political Science, Canadian Studies, and Sociology, I explored current understandings of political representation, public policy, cultural policy, changing patterns of work in Canada, locality and identity, and qualitative research methods. All of these explorations have informed the work which follows, and I am grateful to each of my teachers for their contributions to my learning. The focus of my enquiry remains my own experience, specifically of envisioning as an approach to making cultural policy in two Canadian cities.

Methodology

Over the ten years in which I have been pioneering the use of envisioning in cultural policy making, I have had generous guidance in the practices and applications of envisioning from Warren Ziegler.[2] By contrast, I had not benefited from expert guidance and mentorship in politics or public policy. Nor had I studied these disciplines formally. As a result, I had too little understanding even to integrate the lessons learned in the doing of, for example, the Cultural Futures Project. I came to my formal reading program largely devoid of knowledge about public policy, but with experiences of the way envisioning profoundly affects citizens in expressing their aspirations about the relevant worlds they sought to create by helping to shape public policy. My intention was to learn how and why envisioning might be a valid approach to public policy-making.

Over and over again, in fifteen months of prescribed readings in various disciplines, I discovered issues or challenges posed by current political and social theorists to which envisioning, in my experience, constitutes a possible response. This thesis is an exploration of that insight. Two (supplemental) readings galvanized my conception of envisioning as a public policy process. One was a description of the changing purposes of municipal cultural policy in noncapital European cities, by Franco Bianchini (1993). The other was a call for a nonhierarchical approach to the study of policy making, by Lars Carlsson (1996). In subsequent chapters, I will detail their theories and seek to match their theoretical perspectives on policy production and my experiences with envisioning as an approach to local cultural policy making in Canada.

Matching empirical and theoretical aspects of policy practice for me has been iterative. I would read

Bianchini's and Carlsson's accounts of policy purpose and policy process, listening within myself for resonances with my experience. At a moment of resonance, I would revisit the aspect of my experience which had been recalled by the reading. I did not return to project documents for this but relived in my imagination the experience as I recalled it. If the fit felt full, I would reread the passage which had prompted a recognition to check if what I was remembering of the experience embodied the point being made by the writer. Often this arching would be repeated several times, as I checked back and forth between my memory of an experience and a theory I was now reading which gave insight into the experience. During my iterative reading of these two articles, I experienced this resonance between the theoretical and the empirical many times, and each occasion enriched and extended the previous matches. By this means, I identified the Bianchini and Carlsson articles as particularly fruitful in my search to understand envisioning as an approach to public policy-making.

I returned to both articles many times, repeating the process of matching described above. I tested Bianchini's model of cultural policy purposes by applying it to cultural policy enquiries recently undertaken by selected Canadian cities, and presenting the results of this exploration for presentation at an academic conference.[3] In the same paper, I began to consider the possibility of a fit between

Bianchini's model and the policy outcomes of the Kitchener project. To do so, I turned for the first time to documentation of the project, the written accounts prepared by participants and by myself as project director, selecting and quoting policy outcomes which seemed to illustrate aspects of the four policy purposes posited by Bianchini.

Feeling I had some tentative basis for seeing connections between the types of policy outcomes yielded by envisioning and the policy purposes documented by Bianchini, I turned my attention to Carlsson's contribution to our understanding of the policy-making process, especially his proposal of an alternative methodology for conducting a nonhierarchical implementation analysis. This search led me into the debates in the literature about policy implementation and whether it might be regarded as a separate phase of policy practice or if it was better understood as an aspect of policy production where policy making and implementation are each elements of the other. Again, I experienced resonances between bottom-up (nonhierarchical) implementation analysis as called for by Carlsson and my experience of the practices of envisioning.

As I worked with the Carlsson and Bianchini articles, I recalled two Canadian writers whose ideas augmented and extended the theoretical terrain I was exploring. One was Warren Magnusson (1996), whose recent book, The Search for Political Space, considers the possibility that local municipalities are uniquely suited to configuring political spaces in which ordinary people can engage locally with global issues. The other was Susan Phillips (1991), whose article on interest groups proposed typologies of consultation and of partnership. Serendipitously, a new book by an Australian, Deborah Stevenson (1998), came to my attention. Stevenson's critique of cultural planning caused me to reconsider the adequacy of Bianchini's notions of participatory democracy and her description of an unsatisfactory experience of consultation in the Honeysuckle Project in New South Wales spurred my resolve to offer envisioning as an approach to policy that builds the capacity of citizens to shape their collective futures instead of reducing that capacity as approaches based on conventional consultation tend to do.

Setting the Context

To provide some background and historical context for the explorations which follow, I trace briefly, in Chapter 2, the emergence of culture onto the urban public policy agenda in Canada. Much of what I describe is history I have lived during my two decades of professional involvement in cultural practice. I then document examples of recent cultural policy production in five Canadian localities: Toronto, Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, and Greater Vancouver.

In Chapter 3, I reexamine these five examples in light of Bianchini's theories of the evolving purposes for policy. I then consider the challenges and opportunities posed by Bianchini, Carlsson, Magnusson, Phillips, and Stevenson for public policy-making for culture in Canada today.

In Chapter 4 I describe the practices and principles of envisioning, and give examples of the use of envisioning for developing cultural policy. Chapter 5 describes one of these applications in more detail: the Edmonton Cultural Futures Project. Chapter 6 describes my experience of facilitating a cultural policy envisioning project in Kitchener, Ontario. In a concluding chapter I consider whether envisioning offers a practical alternative approach to making cultural policy, in what ways it differs from traditional approaches, and whether it begins to address some of the challenges and opportunities raised in current thinking about policy practice.

Writing the Case Studies

The two case studies form an important component of this exploration. My purpose in writing them was not just to provide the reader with sufficient information to join with me in assessing envisioning as a potential policy process, but also to revisit both projects as a way of discovering how I now understand my experiences in light of the readings I have undertaken. My method in writing the case studies was to dwell in recalled experience of each project in turn, aided by a rereading of the documentation prepared at the time of the project. This documentation is extensive: complete futures scenarios by multiple teams, with futures-histories of these scenarios and the action plans flowing from them, all in the original words of participants; the recommendations formulated for presentation to the city councils; and the overall "story" of the projects written by me using, for the most part, the words of the participants. In addition to these published reports, I revisited some of the unpublished material: individual compelling images generated by each participant, early drafts of published materials, correspondence, and my notes to file, diary entries, and other informal documentation made at the time. Photographs and newspaper clippings prompted other recollections.

These documents served in two ways. Firstly, they declare the story of the experience as I told it at the time, to myself and to project participants, policy makers, and others. Secondly, the documents helped me to reenter the experience and reimage it. I asked myself, what is/was this experience about, thereby opening myself to new stories I might tell of empirical aspects of policy practice in light of theoretical aspects. These new stories, or retellings, of my experiences of envisioning as a policy approach comprise my learning.

Defining Culture and the Arts

I had not proceeded far in these explorations before I became aware of the plasticity of two key words: culture, and arts. If policy is a slippery concept (Ham & Hill, 1987, p. 101), so is culture. Theorists and commentators from diverse fields have written about the various meanings and definitions ascribed to culture, and how these are changing. One theme that emerged for me is that the definition, especially when used for policy purposes, has been expanding. Commenting on the tendency of arts policies in industrialized countries to converge, Cummings and Katz identified as one feature of this convergence the expansion of the definition of culture, and therefore the range of activities supported by the state:

> An important lesson the advocates of support for "high culture" had to learn was that it is politically advantageous to expand the definition of culture to include more popular art forms and activities. (1987, p. 357)

Cummings and Katz focused here on cultural policy aimed primarily at the arts.

The definition of culture has been challenged and expanded on another front too, one on which we have had first-hand experience in Canada over the past thirty years. I am speaking of the challenge put by multiculturalism to the dominant white and Eurocentric understanding of culture.

Fifty years ago, members of the Massey Commission sought to avoid the use of the word culture because of its "negative connotation of undemocratic exclusivity" (Litt, 1992, p. 84). Mid-century, it was possible, and acceptable, to equate culture with the heritage and language and customs of dominant elites. By 1969, however, ethnic communities were demanding that the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism accord respect and place and voice to them. The resulting public policy on multiculturalism involved recognition and support of the languages, heritages and customs of Canadians whose ethnic background was neither English nor French. Multiculturalism challenged the previously accepted definition of Canadian culture as narrowly ethnocentric and introduced a broader, anthropological dimension to the concept of culture.

D. Paul Schafer (1989), one of Canada's leading commentators on culture and cultural policy, traced the evolution of the word culture from its first uses almost 2000 years ago to present day uses, discovering eight distinctively different conceptions of culture: philosophical, artistic, educational, psychological, historical, anthropological, sociological and biological. Schafer observed that:

> When these conceptions are scrutinized according to the actual time they appeared in the historical literature, it is clear that, chronologically speaking, there has

> been a relentless trend throughout history towards a broader and broader conception and definition of culture. (1989, p. 4)

Schafer goes on to show how different conceptions of culture are invoked for the varying contributions they make to policy, and then introduces a ninth conception of culture: a cosmological one.

I seem to be functioning three stages back, in the anthropological understanding of culture. I have provisionally adopted the definition ratified by participants in the UNESCO-sponsored second World Conference on Cultural Policy held in Mexico City in 1982, and quoted in Schafer:

> Culture ought to be considered today the collection of distinctive traits, spiritual and material, intellectual and affective, which characterize a society or social group. It comprises, besides arts and letters, modes of life, human rights, value systems, traditions and beliefs. (1989, p. 19)

A modified version of this definition was proposed by the Cultural Futures Project and adopted by the City of Edmonton:

> Culture means the sum of the material as well as the intellectual and spiritual distinctive features that characterize a society or group. (Edmonton: A city for the 21st Century, para. 2.6)

My provisional definition of the arts is similarly one adopted by the City of Edmonton:

> Arts means all those symbolic representations of a people's world view transmitted through the media of music, dance, drama, visual arts, literature and crafts, and combinations thereof. (Edmonton, 1994a, p. 1)

While I have adopted these definitions provisionally, the concepts remain protean as I work in policy production. I do not define culture in advance, but invite participants to discover the meanings they are assigning to the word. In the articulation of concerns, visions, and actions, the meanings ascribed to culture by a group of participants become clear in the concrete and specific details, rather than in abstract concepts.

When looking at policy reports produced by others, I will use the terminology as their authors use it. When a definition of culture or the arts is specified in a report, I will include it. Indeed, the definitions ascribed to culture and the arts in the various policy contexts is part of what makes for interesting comparisons.

I have chosen theoretical sources and policy examples which are written in English. This reflects my linguistic limitations, not a lack of awareness or interest in the considerable work being done in Quebec regarding cultural policy at the municipal level.

Chapter 2

Current State of Municipal Cultural Policy in Canada

Choosing where to step into the stream of history as a starting point for the story one wants to tell is necessarily personal and subjective. However, in order to provide something of a historical context for this chapter's account of the current state of municipal cultural policy, I will choose a date: 1978. That was that year in which our national arts advocacy organization, the Canadian Conference of the Arts (CCA), published a commissioned research report on municipal cultural policy (Bailey, 1978) and made it the subject of their annual conference. It had been ten years since the 1967 centennial of Confederation had celebrated Canadian cultural achievements on a national stage with the best of culture from around the world. For two decades The Canada Council for the Arts had been investing in the cultural life of Canadians, effecting a remarkable growth in cultural activity. Provinces and territories had followed suit, establishing departments or arts councils to channel public support to culture. Naturally enough, attention turned to the third level of government, the one closest to the people, easiest to reach, benefiting most directly from contributions culture makes to the community, and--to that point--the one least involved in publicly supporting culture. In this chapter I will trace the emergence of culture onto the public policy agenda at the municipal level in Canada by looking at three interconnected indicators: an impressive series of calls for policy development; a lengthening list of municipalities formalizing cultural policies; and a statistical description of the increase in municipal cultural funding. I will assess the state of the art of municipal cultural policy by reviewing some recent municipal policy enquiries, examining both the content of the policies and the processes by which they were formulated.

Resolution of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities

I have already mentioned the leadership of the CCA in calling for increased municipal government involvement in the arts in 1978. Anticipating the CCA by two years, another national advocacy organization, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), had passed a resolution stating that "the cultural life of Canada's urban communities is an increasingly important responsibility for municipal governments" and asserting that "this area of national concern is too important to be left solely to provincial and federal governments" (Bailey, 1978, au verso). The FCM resolution urged senior levels of government to consult with municipalities on cultural expenditures within their jurisdictions, and to assist municipalities in fulfilling their cultural responsibilities by making additional resources available and by supporting research studies to aid planning. Finally the FCM resolution addressed its member municipalities directly, recommending that they prepare capital and operating plans, establish separate administrative departments for culture, and establish or augment grants.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities suggested specific goals for grant funding support: $1 per capita from municipal sources; $2 per capita from provincial sources; and $3 per capita federal sources, to be achieved by the end of three years. The survey of thirty-three Canadian cities conducted by the CCA in the following year disclosed average municipal grants to arts organizations and facilities to be slightly greater than $1 per capita; however, the range was very wide (from 27 cents for cities in the Atlantic provinces, to $2 for cities in BC), and it was skewed by support for facilities (over one-half of the total municipal grants was for facilities; average per capita expenditures excluding facilities amounted to $.46) (Bailey, 1978, p. 8). It appears from the survey that the funding targets proposed by the FCM for its member municipalities were within view for some, but left room for increases in many others.

It is difficult to know if and to what extent subsequent actions are attributable to the FCM's forthright challenges to its members and to senior levels of government. It may be that the most important outcome of the FCM's setting easily understandable funding targets in per capita terms was that it helped draw attention to this area of municipal expenditures. Since no comparable survey was done at the end of the three-year period, we do not know if the funding targets were reached. From subsequent data, we know that municipal spending on culture (not just grants, as specified in the FCM resolution) increased significantly. However, we should remember that at least some reported increases are attributable to changes in record keeping procedures rather than to actual changes in levels of support. For example, Edmonton was cited as having increased its support for culture tenfold between 1977 and 1985 (McIvor & Elvidge, 1987, p. 1); however at least part of that increase was the result of changes in how expenditures were recorded and reported.

Policy Report by the Toronto Arts Council

Another call for municipal cultural policy was heard in 1985 in a report commissioned by the Toronto Arts Council. Written by accountant and playwright Tom Hendry, _Cultural capital: The care and feeding of Toronto's artistic assets_ was a draft cultural plan offered by the Toronto Arts Council (TAC) to the City of Toronto. _Cultural capital_ is seminal for a number of reasons. Firstly, it called upon Canada's biggest city, and our acknowledged cultural capital city, to formalize its decision making, suggesting that the growth of Toronto's artistic assets had the potential to be even more impressive if nurtured thoughtfully rather than haphazardly. Secondly, the Hendry report sounded the themes we would see reprised in subsequent cultural policy enquiries: public funding as investment rather than aid, cultural tourism, economic impact and job creation, potential for continuing sectoral growth, the arts as research and development for the information economy, regional and intergovernmental imbalances in support, importance of arts education, and the recognition that artists themselves "still provide the largest single component of subsidy through foregone earnings" (Hendry, 1985, p. 19). Thirdly, Cultural capital made a contribution to municipal cultural policy endeavours by offering a definition and aims of cultural policy. Hendry described cultural policy as it affects the arts as "the instrument whereby a city creates the conditions within which the highest, best, and most artistic possibilities of its citizens can be realized" (p. 21). Although the report is replete with financial data and includes an acknowledgement that in the non-profit arts and culture sector social and economic policy goals "overlap completely" (p. 15), Hendry's definition of cultural policy gives preeminence to an artistic purpose. Fourthly, Cultural capital provided the first comprehensive description of a cultural community: the "artists, arts organizations, suppliers, subsidizers and the public for the arts and culture" (p. 1). Hendry also documented the economic impact locally and nationally of the cultural activity and what Toronto was doing for the arts and culture. The research undertaken by Hendry for Cultural capital established a benchmark for other communities in quantifying the dimensions of their cultural activity and became the model for data collection in the Arts and the Cities/Les arts et la ville project, to be discussed shortly.

What was the "important but previously uncollected, unanalyzed, sometimes unknown information" (Hendry, 1985, p. 1) made public by the Hendry report? By 1984 the City of Toronto was spending just over $8 per capita on the arts and culture in Toronto, four times the highest amounts recorded in the CCA's survey from 1977. Toronto had no single staff position with oversight of City activities affecting arts and culture, and no comprehensive budget for arts and culture. The arts community was much bigger than previously thought; the arts and cultural sector was growing much faster than the economy as a whole and appeared to be recession-proof; and employment in this sector was growing much more rapidly than in any other (p. 1). Hendry also discovered that "cities everywhere know very little about the financial and other parameters of their arts and cultural sectors" (p. 3). It was this last discovery, the fact that no city consulted was able to supply data equivalent to the three-year Toronto overview collated by

Hendry, which prompted Tom Hendry and Judith Hendry to propose a national project focused on collecting and exchanging standardized data from Canadian cities on arts and cultural activity within their jurisdictions.

Arts and the Cities/Les arts et la ville

My address to the planning meeting for Arts and the Cities reveals how timely was the Arts and the Cities initiative vis a vis my work as culture director for Edmonton Parks and Recreation.[4] Before setting out my priorities for action by Arts and the Cities, I commented that we were, in Edmonton,

> some way into a [policy] process that began 10 years ago, and one which has shown me clearly how little data we have to guide our decision making, how few options we know about for structuring our support to cultural development, and how little help is available . . . in defining both a process and an outcome.

Twenty-five other Canadian municipalities saw similar need for help with cultural development, and signed on for the inaugural meeting of Arts and the Cities/Les arts et la ville held the following year in Toronto. A third national meeting was hosted by Edmonton in February 1989. No further national meetings were held, although the organization continued with various activities for some years. One contribution was the publication of a Bibliography of precis (n.d.) of Canadian resources concerning municipal cultural policy. The main effort by network partners and Arts and the City staff was to develop a database of municipal cultural data, including a template for recording and forwarding comparable data in standardized formats. The Hendry research for Cultural capital was used as the point of departure, and collective attempts were made to modify the format to accommodate sometimes radically different methods of recording data.

Arts and the Cities/Les arts et la ville was a privately-launched initiative funded from private sources and all three levels of government. After a few years, external funding dwindled; the database did not function as well as users had hoped; and the network ceased as a formal entity. By then, however, departments of finance and other components of participating municipal administrations had wrestled with issues of categorizing cultural spending; member cities had received some glimpses into other cities' ways of supporting the arts and recording that support; and linkages had been established among municipal cultural directors in two dozen Canadian cities.[5] Overall, the Arts and the Cities/Les arts et la ville project nudged large and medium-sized Canadian cities in the direction of deliberate attention to public policy-making for culture at the municipal level.[6]

Canadian Conference of the Arts, Take Two

Whatever progress was made in the decade following the CCA's first efforts to focus attention on municipal cultural policy, it did not satisfy the CCA. In 1987, the CCA again made municipal cultural policy the theme of its annual conference. Convened in Calgary in May, the conference was entitled "A Partnership for Action: Municipalities and the Arts." A background paper prepared for the conference contrasted comprehensive and incremental policy models and gave brief case studies of cultural policy development in seven Canadian municipalities (McIvor & Elvidge, 1987). The authors concluded that municipal arts policy was "still in its infancy" (p. 16), and that the arts community needed to understand more about the structures and decision-making processes of municipal government. To this end, the CCA published, in 1989, an inventory of municipal cultural material held in its resource centre. Municipalities and the arts contained documentation on local cultural policy activity in twenty-four Canadian municipalities, almost all of it having taken place during the 1980s (CCA, 1989). If municipal cultural policy was still in its infancy, at least it had gained weight and expanded its reach during the decade between the two CCA conferences dedicated to its needs. Then, at the end of the decade, a major federal policy report on funding of the arts gave considerable attention to the municipal role.

The Bovey Report

Funding of the arts in Canada to the year 2000 was the report of the federal task force chaired by Edmund C. Bovey. It was not the first report of a senior government jurisdiction to urge an greater role for municipal governments; Financing the arts in Alberta (1981), the Report of the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee (1982), and the Ontario Special Committee for the Arts report (1984) had already done so (McIvor & Elvidge, 1987). However the Bovey report presented data showing municipal funding of arts organizations had "fall[en] far down the scale" (Canada, 1986, p. 81) and declared that it was "realistic to expect municipalities to assume a larger share of arts funding by the year 2000" (p. 84). Bovey quantified the desired increase:

> The Task Force recommends that the share of municipal funding of the arts in Canada increase by 50 per cent from the current 6 per cent to nearly 9 per cent by the year 2000, in constant dollars--that is, from $25 million in 1985 to $70 million in the year 2000--representing a growth rate of 7 per cent a year. (Canada, 1986, p. 84)

This recommendation for an increase in the municipal share of funding was part of a larger vision formulated by Bovey. He called for increases across the board--by consumers, the private sector, and all three levels of government.

However, for the federal and provincial levels, Bovey proposed that their share of the funding liability decrease, while still growing in actual amounts. So, for example, the federal share was to decrease from 23 percent in 1985 to 19 percent by 2000, still an effective annual growth rate of 4 percent. Similarly, the combined provincial share of 28 percent in 1985 was to decrease to 24 percent, also an effective annual growth rate of 4 percent. When we compare these recommendations for the federal and provincial levels, we see that Bovey was calling for significant actual increases by the municipalities (a 50 percent increase from 6 percent of all funding to 9 percent of all funding), as well as a greater relative role for the local government vis a vis the provincial and federal jurisdictions.

Whether Bovey was persuasive or merely prescient, the realignment he formulated (although not the actual increases) does seem to have begun. The Cultural Statistics Program (CSP) of Statistics Canada gives a statistical description of the changing patterns of governmental funding of culture.

Shifting Government Expenditure Patterns

CSP began in 1972, the annual government expenditure surveys in 1976-77. The first year for which data was collected on municipal support to culture was 1984. In 1985, a single figure expressing total cultural expenditures by municipalities for 1981-82 was published (Statistics Canada [SC], 1985, p. 7). A methodological note explains that the results obtained from a sampling of municipalities by the Public Institutions Division of Statistics Canada was used to estimate the transactions of all municipalities (SC, 1985, p. 48).

Having appeared on the CSP horizon, municipal expenditures on culture have received steadily increasing attention through the balance of the 1980s and to the present. A 1992 analysis of government cultural support during 1989-90, the year following release of the Bovey report, documented total municipal expenditures on culture ($1.1 billion), average municipal spending increase (31 percent, compared with 12 percent for both provincial and federal), and average municipal expenditures per capita ($41) (SC, 1992, p. 3). Municipal cultural expenditures increased for six consecutive years from 1985-86 through 1990-91 (SC, 1993, p. 3). With the exceptions of the years 1991-92 and 1995-96, increases at the municipal level have continued, with the overall increase for the first half of the current decade being 15 percent (SC, 1997, p. 3; SC, 1998, p. 11). Then in 1996-97, the most recent year for which data is available, the rate of increase slowed to 1.6 percent (SC, 1998, p. 11), perhaps a signal that municipal spending will follow the pattern of declining support already established at the federal and provincial/territorial levels.

While remaining the biggest public funder of culture, the federal government has slowed the rate of its support. Federal expenditures on culture fell (in current dollars) for the first time in 1991-92 (SC, 1993, pp. 2-3); held steady at 1 percent for the middle part of the current decade; and declined by 5 percent in 1996-97, the most recent year for which data is available (SC, 1998, p. 11). A similar pattern emerges when we scrutinize the combined cultural expenditures of provinces and territories. Provincial and territorial spending on culture expanded from 1985 through 1993 before beginning four years of decline (SC, 1997, p. 3; SC, 1998, p. 11).

Until the Cultural Statistics Program was established and began analyzing and publishing data on municipal cultural expenditures, data collection had lagged behind the increasing policy attention being given to culture. During the 1980s, several ad hoc attempts were made to supply the data needed to support policy production; however each data collection project was idiosyncratic and did not lend itself to meaningful comparisons between cities or over time. For these reasons, it is almost impossible to determine if a certain set of expenditure targets was ever met. We can, however, use the data from the Cultural Statistics Program to identify broad patterns in expenditures on culture at the municipal level.

We can conclude from these patterns that municipal expenditures grew substantially between the mid 1980s and the mid 1990s, although the rate of growth is now decreasing and perhaps the growth phase is coming to an end. Provincial and territorial expenditures peaked six years ago, and have been declining since. The federal government, while still the major public funder of culture in Canada, slowed its support to one percent increases in constant dollars for the first six years of this decade, and then logged a sharp decrease (5 percent) in the most recent year for which data is available. Spending by all governments has declined in real terms for seven consecutive years (CS, 1998, p. 11).

Increased Attention to Policy Production

Spending by governments, however, is only one manifestation of the increasing attention to culture at the municipal level. Policy production is another indicator. At the start of the current decade, most of the 250 municipalities responding to a questionnaire distributed by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities indicated that they had developed policy and support mechanisms to assist arts, culture and heritage in their communities (FCM, 1991). Nearly 80 percent provided direct cash grants to groups, and 64 percent had a council committee, community advisory body, or similar group to provide advice or to deal with programs and funding. There was no indication of how many municipalities had administrative departments or competent professionals overseeing cultural activities and planning, as called for by Bailey and Bovey. Eighty-two municipalities (30 percent of the respondents) reported that they had developed a written cultural plan or set of policies in support of arts, culture, and heritage. Evidently not just culture, but also cultural policy, had been a growth industry of the eighties.

Five recent examples of policy development in Canadian cities reveal several shared characteristics: they were undertaken by task forces of appointed persons; they were mandated to address specified issues; they used fairly standard processes of idea collection and analysis as a basis for developing policy proposals; and they assumed implementation is a separate, later phase, to be undertaken by persons other than those proposing the policy. One of the five, the Toronto Arts Council's enquiry into cultural equity, displays variations on the above themes, especially when it issues forth into an implementation project called CultureForce; however, the five generally share enough features to comprise a representative cultural policy process for urban municipalities in English-speaking Canada in the 1990s.

Recent Examples of Municipal Cultural Policy

All but one of the examples used a task force in developing cultural policy. The Vancouver Arts Initiative (1993) and the Edmonton Mayor's Task Force on Investment in the Arts (1994) were composed of volunteer community leaders in the arts, business and other sectors. In the cases of the Calgary Civic Arts Policy (1996) and the Regional Cultural Steering Committee of the Greater Vancouver Regional District (1997), the task force was made up of staff or volunteers holding office within the agencies for whom the policy was being developed, or both. Both task forces--the external or community one, and the internal one made up of agency officers--were politically mandated, and they presented their recommendations to the mandating political body for decision and action. Within each task force, however, there were many variations in approach.

In the task forces made up of community leaders, members were selected and appointed by city councils. The Vancouver Arts Initiative (VAI) working group included two city councillors and was chaired by the mayor. Nominations for members had been invited from artists, arts administrators, and other interested parties (Vancouver, 1993). In Edmonton, the mayor's task force included a councillor and was chaired by an arts community leader. The Vancouver and Edmonton task forces both received their mandates from their city councils. The Vancouver Arts

Initiative working group's mandate focused on the fiscal health of the city's professional arts organizations, public perception of the arts, and increasing "community awareness of, and participation in, the arts in Vancouver" (Vancouver, 1993, p. 26). The city council also asked the working group to address "current federal, provincial and regional funding imbalances" (p. 27). The concern for funding levels and for the roles of all governments was evident, too, in the mandate given to the members of the mayor's task force in Edmonton. Their objectives included specific instruction to "evaluate different models for funding and promoting the arts"; to "review existing research relating to the rôle of the arts in Edmonton's community and economy;" and to "address specific policy issues identified in previous studies on the arts in Edmonton" (Edmonton, 1994a, p. 1). Here the similarities end; the two task forces went about their work in different ways.

Vancouver

The Vancouver Arts Initiative implemented a wide-ranging consultative process and used the ideas and information gathered as the basis of its recommendations to city council. Responses to four questions were sought from an extensive list of six hundred individuals and organizations in the arts community. Task force members formed subcommittees to personally interview one-quarter of the people on the list, randomly selected from within categories. The remaining 450 people were invited by mail to respond to the same four questions. All responses were incorporated into an interim report which took the form of a workbook. The workbook was distributed to all six hundred people on the master list, members of the business community, the media, and interested individuals. Public meetings were held to hear responses to the ideas in the workbook. These presentations, plus written responses, were incorporated into the report submitted to city council eighteen months following creation of the task force. The idea-gathering approach is evident in the report's dozens of pragmatic recommendations of ways to improve the City's support to the arts. The report acknowledges that while the task force had solicited concrete solutions to today's challenges, respondents offered more than that:

> They also shared their broader vision for the future of the arts in Vancouver. What emerged was a vision of Vancouver's potential as a creative city: a city where the arts are valued as highly as the natural beauty that surrounds it. (Vancouver, 1993, p. 2)

From this vision came the title of the report, Toward the creative city.

One set of recommendations concerned the needs of individual artists for funding, housing and work spaces, and public recognition for the way artists enrich the quality of life in Vancouver. Another set addressed arts opportunities for youth, especially within the formal education system. A third set of recommendations concerned new concepts and sources of support: grants, facilities, in-kind support through civic departments, and creative partnerships. Included under creative partnerships were an annual arts forum; a regional advisory body to encourage municipalities to work jointly on regional arts issues; a task force to encourage joint endeavours between the arts and tourism industries; and tax incentives to assist in making arts organizations attractive to large-scale donors. Beyond the recommendations themselves, the report appends a note on the "the structural imbalance of arts funding in Vancouver" (Vancouver, 1993, p. 21), urging regional and provincial participation and commitment to resolving these larger funding issues. Overall, the recommendations in the Vancouver report aim at strengthening the health of the Vancouver arts community in myriad incremental ways: from poster kiosks to a resource centre that encourages artistic exchange and development, from short-term credit to a strike and weather insurance fund, from declaring a "year of the artist" to considering residential tax rates for live/work studios, from establishing an arts endowment fund to expanding the program of grants available to groups renting Vancouver's city-owned theatres.

Edmonton

In contrast to the multifoliate recommendations of Vancouver's Toward a creative city, Edmonton's Building creative capital: An investment plan for the arts in Edmonton (1994a) hones all of its arguments toward a single thrust--the creation of an autonomous arts council for Edmonton. Besides being "the most desirable option for both the arts community and the general public" (Edmonton, 1994a, p. 7), an independent council was, in the view of the task force, "the means to implement many of the recommendations put forward in this report" (p. 8). According to the task force, an independent council would be a unified voice for the arts in Edmonton and operate more efficiently and more effectively than the structure it was to replace. It would have strong links with city council, Economic Development Edmonton and the Edmonton business community, and be fully accountable to its constituents. Besides, it was the model "successfully adopted by other major centres across Canada and the United States" (p. 7).

The task force felt that, once an arm's-length arts council was established, it would be instrumental in helping to achieve the other objectives set out in the report: increasing private sector involvement and public awareness, clarifying the role of governments, increasing the level of direct municipal investment, and rationalizing indirect municipal support of the arts. In these recommendations clarifying the role of governments was a call for the city to develop an arts policy, and for the city and the proposed arts council to facilitate greater cooperation and collaboration among the three levels of government. Direct investment targets were offered in the report: $5 per capita by the year 2000, through annual increases from the 1994 level of $2.95 (Edmonton, 1994b, p. 3). This target was for grants to arts organizations and did not include other forms of municipal support to the arts, such as use of city-owned facilities, provision of staff, subsidized taxes or lease rates, or in-kind support; nor did it include other cultural expenditures such as funding for libraries and heritage institutions.

The same singleness of purpose revealed in the task force's recommendations was evident in the task force's process. No broad consultation like Vancouver's was undertaken. Rather the task force met with fifteen city agencies and community organizations to develop strategic alliances or deflect potential opposition: the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues and several of its area councils; the city's police, finance, and recreation departments; downtown planning and business groups; Economic Development Edmonton; and the Edmonton Community Foundation. The task force negotiated letters of endorsement from the two agencies whose roles would be most affected by the creation of an autonomous arts council: the Parks and

Recreation Department and the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. One public open house was held, attended by 55 people; questionnaires used to solicit feedback asked only a few very focused questions. Research involved comparing levels of grant support in five Canadian and two nonCanadian cities, and examining other cities' use of the arts council model (not, as the task force's mandate stipulated, evaluating different models for funding and promoting the arts). The task force presented its arguments for renewed investment in the arts in terms of Edmonton's place on the artistic map, contributions of the arts to economic development, reasons why "investing in the arts is sound business" (Edmonton, 1994a, p. 4), and justifications for investing in the arts in Edmonton. The decision to emphasize economic benefits was deliberate; the task force members:

> did not consider it necessary to demonstrate, yet again, the importance of the arts for the quality of life in Edmonton. . . . The thrust of the Task Force was to recommend mechanisms, policies and structures which recognize the economic importance of the arts in Edmonton. (p. 1)

The careful honing of the entire process to achieve the establishment of an arts council was evident, too, in the inclusion of an implementation strategy for the first recommendation. An implementation team was proposed, to be made up of the city manager, representatives from the task force, staff from the finance and recreation departments, and representatives of pertinent agencies. The implementation team was to develop a plan for the formation of the arts council, including identifying "funds to be reallocated within existing approved budgets for an initial three year period" (Edmonton, 1994a, pp. 8-9) and report back to city council within six weeks. The task force intended this action strategy to involve affected city departments and agencies in shaping the council on which the task force's recommendations hinged, thereby increasing the likelihood of their support. Once created, the arts council itself would be instrumental in realizing the remaining recommendations of the report.[7]

As different as were the policy approaches of Edmonton and Vancouver, both were undertaken by task forces composed of community members. In the next two examples, Calgary and the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD), policies were prepared by internal task groups or committees composed of staff and officers of the agencies that were the subject and object of the policies being developed. The GVRD's Regional Cultural Plan steering committee was made up of staff with cultural planning responsibilities in thirteen of the twenty-two member municipalities comprising Greater Vancouver (GVRD, 1997). In Calgary, four agencies have been responsible for the City's support to culture: Calgary

Parks and Recreation, the Calgary Region Arts Foundation, the Calgary Centre for the Performing Arts, and the Calgary Allied Arts Foundation. Faced with an old and dated policy, representatives of the four agencies worked together to draft a new one. Some of the representatives were staff; others were volunteers from within an agency, for example a president or other executive officer of the board (K. Hartley, personal communication, February 8, 1999). In both Greater Vancouver and Calgary the impetus for policy development originated with staff, although (as we saw above) concerns about regional funding imbalances had been brought to Vancouver City Council's attention four years previously in the Vancouver Arts Initiative report. Also in the case of Greater Vancouver, the strategic cultural planning process was mandated by the GVRD Board (GVRD, 1997). Neither the Greater Vancouver nor Calgary enquiries had the participation of elected politicians.

Calgary

Within the shared structure of an internal or agency task force, the Calgary and Greater Vancouver enquiries pursued quite different approaches. In Calgary, committee members met over a six-month period with a facilitator from the staff of the Parks and Recreation Department to clarify definitions, conduct an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, and prepare a report for consideration by the parks board, the responsible committee of city council, and eventually council itself (K. Hartley, personal communication, February 8, 1999). The task force limited its scope to policy statements guiding civic support to culture, as opposed to statements meant to guide cultural development for the community. Because the policy under development was to guide the civic corporation and its agencies, not community organizations, no consultation was undertaken (K. Hartley, personal communication, February 8, 1999).

One of the interesting features of the Calgary civic arts policy is the definition of the arts it embraces:

> Broadly defined, art is the finished expression of the combined work, skill, creativity, and knowledge of the artist. These expressions come in numerous forms and can be presented through a variety of mediums. . . . includ[ing] but not limited to the visual arts, the literary arts, the performing arts, and arts festivals. (Calgary, 1996, p. 1)

Other policy enquiries emphasize the centrality of the creative artist, but Calgary's definition embeds the centrality of the artist right in the definition of the arts, defining art as the expression of the artist. "Artist" is not defined.

The Calgary policy is distinct also in that, while it acknowledges the social and economic benefits of the arts, it also recognizes a role for the arts which is generally difficult for governments to embrace. That role is the power of the arts to "challenge existing concepts, introduce controversy and provoke dialogue" (p. 13); to "question, provoke and stimulate society, while reexamining our traditions" (p. 3).

The main recommendation of the policy review and the main thrust of the resultant policy adopted by city council was to reconfirm the four-agency system of delivering civic support to the arts in Calgary. The existing roles and responsibilities for each of the four were spelled out and commitments made to ensure that their roles "continue to be complementary and available resources are efficiently utilized" (p. 14). The agencies commit also to "listen to the arts community and understand their needs and expectations," and to "respond in a responsible manner" (p. 14). The policy directs the agencies--that is, they direct themselves--to meet challenges related to "accommodat[ing] new and growing arts groups within stable or shrinking resources" (p. 13) and to consider community support and fiscal management when allocating funds. In addition, the four agencies commit to acting as advocates, a role which government entities are sometimes reluctant to embrace. To increase integration of the arts into the community, the agencies will advocate the personal, civic, and economic benefits of the arts, and "encourage the understanding of individual and cultural diversity through the arts" (p. 14). City council passed the recommended policy, making only "a couple of cosmetic changes" (K. Hartley, personal communication, February 8, 1999).

Greater Vancouver

Greater Vancouver's steering committee used a process quite different from Calgary's. The partners in Greater Vancouver's case were independent municipalities linked by a shared concern and a regional governance structure, the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD). The GVRD had been in existence for thirty years, aware of the importance of cultural development and cultural planning for twenty years, and had directly funded regional cultural enterprises for ten years (GVRD, 1997). However, the previous decade had brought dramatic changes to the population, demographics and economy of the region, putting pressure on existing resources and pointing up funding inequities among municipalities and across the four levels of government. To "get a current picture and to create a common base of information and data" (pp. 4-5), the steering committee commissioned three research studies from independent consultants and undertook a fourth research task itself. The latter was a comprehensive inventory of municipally supported cultural resources which quantified each municipality's cultural profile and created thereby a composite profile for the Region. The commissioned studies surveyed regional attendance patterns for arts and culture events in Greater Vancouver, measured the economic importance of arts and cultural activity in Greater Vancouver, and compared models of regional cultural involvement in three Canadian and four United States metropolitan areas with a view to identifying best practices. The findings led the steering committee to conclude that the level of regional activity, infrastructure, and benefits warranted attention by the GVRD and could be "more effectively maintained and enhanced through proactive regional involvement" (p. 20); and that "local communities, or sub-regional clusters of communities, will also benefit from greater co-ordination of public expenditures . . . and through strategic partnerships among local governments" (p. 20). Accordingly, the steering committee recommended that its progress report be received by the GVRD and referred to GVRD municipalities for their information and that the GVRD proceed to the next phase in the process of developing a regional strategic plan for arts and culture. That next phase would involve stakeholders and potential partners in identifying issues to be addressed, developing "a complete range of policy choices and options" (Appendix B), setting priorities for choices and options to form a draft set of proposals, consulting the general public, and revising the committee's proposed strategy for consideration by the GVRD Board and member municipalities.

Public consultation, then, would constitute a component of the next phase. Given the information being sought by the steering committee in the first phase, commissioned research studies were an obvious methodology to employ; i.e., by this means, the steering committee was able to generate information which was current, targeted to its policy purposes, customized to its geographic area, and which yielded some sub-regional patterns. The arguments framed on behalf of the arts are thus timely, specific and local, rather than generalized from the standard sources upon which Calgary and Edmonton had relied to make their cases for the economic and social benefits of the arts.[8] Increased sophistication is evident in how the arguments are framed. For example, claims regarding the economic benefits of the arts are qualified with an acknowledgment that the arts and cultural sector makes economic contributions "like any other 'industry'" (p. 10).

Toronto: A Distinct Issue and a Distinct Approach

Economic arguments are absent from the Toronto Cultural equity report. As the name indicates, the report concerns itself not with an overall cultural or arts policy but with a specific issue facing the Toronto cultural community: cultural equity. In commissioning the report, the Toronto Arts Council had as its intent neither quantifying and describing current cultural activity, as did Greater Vancouver; nor reconciling and reconfirming roles of city agencies, as did Calgary; nor collecting and addressing the arts community's various issues, as did Vancouver; nor establishing a specific civic structure for supporting culture, as did Edmonton. Rather, the Toronto Arts Council was concerned with transforming its very self, so that "it would be--and would be seen to be--no longer part of a problem [of cultural inequity], but part of a solution" (Julian, 1992, p. 1).

The problem addressed by the Toronto Arts Council (TAC) was two-fold: the need for representation of specific cultural communities at all levels of decision-making by TAC and the need for resources, both funds and personnel, that were adequate to the amount and maturity of activity by artists in Toronto's diverse cultural communities. The report's author acknowledged that "confer[ing] full membership" (Julian, 1992, p. 3) on specific cultural communities underserved by TAC in the face of economic stringency would "engender a dynamic process of renewal within a sector of our community not yet in command of sufficient resources to meet its obligations to its own members and to the overall community of Toronto" (p. 4). In other words, addressing the issue of cultural equity--"put[ing] the 'E' in front of Quality'" (p. 1)--could not be achieved without altering the very nature of the organization. The TAC board had already recognized this and taken first steps; now to help them accelerate changes already initiated, the board hired E. A. Julian to scrutinize the council's decision-making processes, consult with the underserved communities, and recommend specific strategies for inclusive representation and more equitable access to resources. Julian approached her task through a combination of analysis and critique of (then) current practices; consultation, education and animation of affected constituencies (including the arts council, its board, committees, juries and staff); consciousness-raising interviews with relevant individuals and groups, including elected city officials; and thoughtful formulation of strategies for consideration by both the TAC and the City of Toronto.

One of Julian's recommendations was that the Board of Directors of the Toronto Arts Council develop a comprehensive arts and cultural policy for the City of Toronto "predicated upon a policy of cultural equity" (1992, p. 10). Here the familiar call for comprehensive cultural policy is wedded to a larger societal injustice needing to be addressed in the cultural community specifically, and one which is perhaps amenable to leadership from the arts and culture sector. Julian identifies this leadership opportunity when she asserts that "[a]dopting cultural equity as the ultimate aim of all its policies and delivery of services . . . [will put] the Toronto Arts Council proactively into the struggle to develop a city based on principles of equity" (p. 3). Subsequent recommendations detail specific changes the TAC must make to ensure that its programs and decision-making processes are transparent to all cultural communities, even those for which language itself is a barrier. Besides getting its policy house in order and informing all potential client communities about programs and resources available, the TAC should "ensure appropriate levels of participation, as members of TAC's Board, Arts Discipline Committees and juries, by qualified artists and arts and cultural workers based in the city's specific cultural communities" (p. 12). Appropriate representation was to be achieved not by quotas or dedicated funding programs (artists felt that this would result in marginalization or ghettoization) but by "transformed processes of decision-making and evaluation of artistic issues" (p. 21). Such transformation would require additional capacity, both in increased funding and in enhanced management capability. Julian set the price of those enhanced capabilities at $1 million and $250,000 respectively. Recognizing that "the current economic situation alone guarantees unfortunate but unavoidable delay" (p. 1), but equally clear that "underlying the rhetoric of access is a very real need for action" (p. 21), Julian recommended that the Arts Council "develop flexible interim initiatives to enable artists and arts organizations and groups within specific cultural communities to benefit from TAC services" (p. 18). Such a flexible interim initiative was indeed launched within four months of publication of Cultural equity.

CultureForce

The CultureForce project of the Toronto Arts Council was an implementation--more than that, an enactment--of the policy on cultural equity. Three underserved communities identified in the Cultural equity report were invited into "a closer and more dynamic and critical relationship" (Fernandez, 1994, p. 3) with the arts council for purposes of strengthening and changing not only those specific cultural communities but also the Toronto Arts Council itself. Funds flowed directly to existing or nascent arts service organizations in the First Nations, Black, and Asian and Latin American Canadian communities to enable them to develop infrastructure appropriate to their communities. Information flowed both ways, changing the perceptions and actions of persons within the specific cultural communities and changing the perceptions and actions of the Toronto Arts Council's directors, committee members, juries, and staff:

> The greater awareness and understanding of other cultures which CultureForce has engendered among individuals has had an impact on the policies,

> programmes, systems, attitudes and assumption of the TAC as well as the communities concerned. (Fernandez, 1994, p. 2)

The transformation of the TAC was further assisted through getting to know artists based in specific cultural communities who might be willing to serve on the juries and committees as well as the board of the council. When the CultureForce secretariat did a review in 1994 of the 1992 Cultural equity report, it established that 98 percent of all recommendations were in process, and that 60 percent were close to being accomplished. The Toronto Arts Council's desire to collaborate with specific cultural communities to "repaint this picture [of cultural equity] and reword this story" was well advanced (p. 5).

Conclusions

The emergence of cultural policy onto the public policy agenda in Canada can be charted by successive calls for policy development, various ad hoc and then systematic attempts to collect data on municipal cultural expenditures, and eventually through policy activity in numerous Canadian municipalities. In the five recent examples reviewed above, a typical approach to policy emerges. A task force of persons with expertise in the area of culture is appointed and given a mandate to address specified issues. It approaches its task through standard methods of research, consultation and analysis, and makes recommendations which others will implement. In a variation on this model, the Toronto Arts Council's enquiry into cultural equity appointed an expert consultant, followed a similar process to the others, and then moved immediately to implement the recommendations in a powerful project called CultureForce. Before I posit a possible alternative approach to cultural policy in Chapter 4, I would like to look at some of the challenges being posed to policy production, including but not limited to production of cultural policy. This will enable us to situate my consideration of cultural policy processes in the context of current social and political thinking about locality, identity, citizenship, and culture.

Chapter 3

Changing Purposes and Processes of Public Policy[9]

In the previous chapter, I described the emergence of culture onto the municipal public policy agenda in Canada since 1978, and looked at some recent policy enquiries conducted in English in major urban centres. The increasing attention given to the municipal level over the past twenty years seems to constitute a third wave of cultural policy in Canada, where the first wave was the surge in national policy activity following the Second World War and the second wave was the gradual, region-by-region engagement with cultural policy by provincial governments beginning in 1946 and cresting in the mid-to-late 1980s. Each wave can be charted by its policy consultations, the governance structures put in place to implement policies, and the waxing and waning of the funding made available to culture. The successive phases overlap, and each impacts the others. However, these developments in cultural policy are themselves reflective of, and perhaps in some instances causative of, larger societal forces affecting policy making. Furthermore, not only is the context for policy making changing, so is our understanding of policy--its purposes, and the processes by which it is developed and implemented.

Perhaps the most important factor in the emergence of culture onto the policy agenda in western industrialized countries was the rise of the welfare state following the Second World War. Fields of human endeavour previously considered to be outside the purview of government became the focus of government policy and spending. This involvement was enabled by stable and steadily increasing economic growth and corresponding increases in government budgets. Demand for cultural services was stimulated by significant social changes including increases in urbanization, leisure time, education levels, discretionary income, and awareness of other countries and cultures through travel and--after 1953--television (Cummings & Katz, 1987; Bianchini, 1993a). The post-war years were a time of relative consensus on the role of government and of faith in the capacity of government to intervene to the benefit of citizens. It was also a time of relative prosperity, and economic and social stability. The civil service expanded and became increasingly professional. Policy was understood to be a rational process of carrying out the sovereign will of the state (Carlsson, 1996).

In this environment, culture took a place along with other areas of state involvement, as "a legitimate and worthwhile element of society, as deserving of governmental assistance as are the many other groups that are aided by the state" (Cummings & Katz, 1987, p. 365). According to Bianchini (1993a), cultural policy at the local level at midcentury could be characterized as "relatively unimportant, noncontroversial areas of local policy making" (p. 9). Based on a narrow definition of culture as equating to the "'pre-electronic' arts" (Bianchini, 1993a, p. 9) urban cultural policies in that era had as their purpose "promoting high quality art and widening access to it" (p. 18).

At the national level, we would recognize this as the era of the Massey Commission, the watershed enquiry into Canadian cultural life conducted between 1949 and 1951. Chaired by Vincent Massey, later to become Governor-General, and made up of five highly educated and cultured Canadians, the Royal Commission on National Development of the Arts, Letters, and Sciences in Canada recommended an arm's-length funding body for the arts and sciences, which was established six years later, in 1957. The Commission's concern was for raising the quality of the arts and widening access to them, and this has remained the mandate of The Canada Council for the Arts which was established as a result of the Commission's work. The consultation was a broad one, with the commissioners travelling the length and breadth of the country, viewing many local arts events as they went.

Despite wide regional and disciplinary variations in the input received, the commissioners were able to formulate coherent recommendations addressing the issues and concerns presented to them. They made deft use of political arguments to support their bid for increased government support for culture. The commissioners argued that Canada should be willing to invest in developing the culture that it was so ready to defend with military spending (Canada, 1951, p. 274). A second argument made by the commissioners, which persists to the present, was that culture contributes to a national identity distinct from that of the United States, and developing our own culture would enable us to withstand the deleterious effects of US cultural imperialism.[10] Beyond these justifications, though, the Massey Report drew connections between culture and education (in the broadest sense) rather than between culture and economic development, tourism, or employment creation. These connections were to emerge in later phases of cultural policy development, in many cases in conjunction with the Massey-era concern for promoting high-quality art and widening access to it.

The Politicization of Culture

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the rise of new urban social movements ruptured the previous social cohesion and changed the context for policy-making in western industrialized countries. "[F]eminism, youth revolts, environmentalism, community action, and gay and ethnic/racial minority activism" all had clear cultural as well as political dimensions (Bianchini, 1993a, p. 9).

Often they were closely associated with the alternative culture sector, which challenged traditional distinctions between 'high' and 'low' cultural forms, combining the two in innovative ways and thereby radically broadening the definition of culture. These urban social movements also saw cultural action and political action as inseparable. In response, local authorities (in the western European noncapital cities analyzed by Bianchini) moved away from earlier stances in which cultural policy was viewed as neutral and without political value to using cultural strategies to achieve social and political objectives, and to build a new political base with the urban social movements (Bianchini, 1993a). The emphasis was on personal and community development, participation, egalitarianism, democratization of urban social space, and revitalization of urban public life. Access to culture for disadvantaged groups was of particular importance, and in Europe new-left politicians devolved resources and power to grassroots groups. Culture came to be seen by local leaders as an alternative to traditional strategies for political communication and mobilization (Bianchini, 1993a). Policy goals included integrating unemployed young people, new residents, immigrants, and social groups displaced by economic restructuring. Public festivals and cultural animation became components of cultural programming.

In Canada, borrowing again from the federal level, this phase corresponds to the "democratization and decentralization" policies of Gerard Pelletier, when the Opportunities for Youth and Local Initiatives grant programs extended the boundaries of, and access to, culture beyond the elitist conceptions of the Massey era. It continued with the proclamation in 1971 of a multicultural society within a bilingual framework and in the subsequent federal policies, programs and agencies established in support of official multiculturalism. During that time, the CCA's primer on municipal support to the arts included detailed descriptions of how to start and run a festival and how to set up a community cultural centre (Bailey, 1978). Toronto had its Caravan Festival, and Edmonton began its Heritage Days celebration of specific cultural groups. The participatory and community development character of the 1970s endures in Edmonton's many populist festivals (the Fringe, First Night, Folk, The Works), and in the criteria for funding festivals (Edmonton, 1996).

The consultation process was democratized as well, with a shift in Canada from royal commissions of elite persons to a more participatory task force model with representation from a wider spectrum of society. With greater diversity among task force members (and greater numbers), as well as greater diversity in points of view put forward, task forces had a harder time reaching consensus. When they did do so, it was often by omitting some of the strongly-felt positions put forward to them, with a resulting disenchantment on the part of groups whose voices had not survived the synthesizing stage of the consultation (Phillips, 1991). The Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee (1982) illustrates the difficulty of public consultation during this phase of cultural policy in Canada. An earlier commission of enquiry, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1965), experienced first hand the shift in Canada from broad social consensus to emergent group identities within Canadian citizenship. When the Commission began its work, its mandate assumed a bilingual and bicultural nation. By 1969, the commissioners had discovered such strong assertiveness among self-identified ethnocultural groups that they were obliged to prepare a fourth book on the multicultural nature of Canada. As we shall see, these trends were amplified by subsequent political actions (passing of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act in 1988 and creation of a department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship in 1991) and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, adopted in 1982.

Culture in the Service of Economic Goals

> The most important historical trend [in the strategic objectives of cultural policy] is the shift from the social and political concerns prevailing during the 1970s to the economic development and urban

> regeneration priorities of the 1980s. (Bianchini, 1993a, p. 2)

The virtually uninterrupted growth in cultural budgets of many western industrialized countries during the middle decades of this century came to an end between 1975 and 1985 as a result of the economic dislocations triggered by the oil shocks of 1973 and 1979 (Cummings & Katz, 1987). Bianchini (1993a), confirms that in the late 1970s and early 1980s, cities in Europe began to feel the effects of economic restructuring that was taking place globally. Efforts by nations to insulate their jurisdictions against the negative effects of global economic restructuring were hampered by the mobility of capital, raw materials, and, to some extent, the talent pool. Cities responded by developing their own strategies for survival and growth in the face of economic restructuring. Culture figured prominently in these strategies: high profile arts events, prestigious festivals, and flagship cultural projects became part of the "'internationalization' strategies" of cities (Bianchini, 1993a, p. 14). Efforts to improve administration, make the most effective use of available resources through collaboration, and increase funds from private sector sponsorship became hallmarks of cultural policy during this phase. Increasingly, cultural expenditures were justified on economic grounds. Inclusion of cultural industries expanded the definition of culture.

Direct ties were made between culture and expanding economic sectors such as tourism, sports, recreation, arts, and the media thereby extending the purview of cultural policy. The language of subsidy changed to the language of investment.

For examples of this phase of cultural policy in Canada, we can at last turn to the municipal level. Municipal jurisdictions in Canada, too, have enlisted cultural policy in service of economic development and city image. The impetus behind the shift is much the same for Canadian urban centres as it was for the major cities of western Europe: it was "initially a defensive strategy aimed at preserving existing levels of cultural expenditures" (Bianchini, 1993a, p. 12). However, gradually we came to realize the potency of arguments which linked culture to goals of city marketing and regeneration. During this decade, frequent calls were heard for cities in Canada to develop cultural policies. Toronto was the bellwether, with publication in 1985 of Hendry's report on Toronto's cultural assets. Cultural capital established the pattern of documenting the dimensions and scope of the cultural activities of a community including estimating the economic impact, job creation, tourism, and city image benefits of support to culture. Subsequent reports made use of task forces of business and arts leaders and, as we have seen in the examples given in the previous chapter, sought to establish ties with partners in business, tourism, economic development, and employment while retaining earlier partnerships with education and recreation. Many Canadian urban municipalities constructed arts and cultural centres with goals of making culture accessible to their citizens, revitalizing an area in need of physical regeneration, fuelling a local economy, and making a symbolic statement to internal and external audiences about a local urban renaissance. Flagship cultural projects less often took the form of festivals, however the CCA has proposed as one of its millennium projects a program of Canadian cultural capitals modelled after the decade-old European program of designating a City of Culture each year (Kostash, 1999, p. 3).

Extending the coalition of cultural interests and expanding the definition of culture have been successful strategies for increasing public support for culture (Cummings & Katz, 1987). Cultural policies once again became noncontroversial in that the economic and city marketing justifications for culture and the activities supported by this rationale "enjoyed a remarkable degree of political consensus" (Bianchini, 1993b, p. 200). As we might expect, a period of consensus permitted great gains in directions congruent with economic rationales; however, the privileging of economic purposes for cultural policy is being challenged by new claims of identity and interest. A reexamination of the five policy examples from the previous chapter reveals how they conform to and diverge from the currently dominant mode described by Bianchini.

A Rereading of Five Urban Cultural Policies

Bianchini acknowledges that justifications for urban cultural policy-making have not evolved in a simple progression, with each new argument replacing the traditional ones; rather, "old and new, social and economic, community and elite-oriented, arguments coexist, often uneasily, within the agenda of city governments" (1993a, p. 3). This mix is evident in differing proportions in the cultural policy enquiries of Toronto, Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, and Greater Vancouver.

The Vancouver recommendations focus on improving the lot of the artist and on widening access to the arts principally but not exclusively for residents. In this, and in its narrow definition of the arts, Toward the creative city carries echoes of Bianchini's first phase of cultural policy, where the policy purpose is the production of high quality art and widening access to it. Some emphasis is placed on social purposes of cultural policy, specifically providing arts for youth and ensuring that all artists, of whatever heritage, have equitable access to civic funds. In these social priorities, Bianchini's second phase of cultural policy resonates. There are also recommendations that encourage joint endeavours between the arts and tourism industries and private sector donations to nonprofit cultural activities, both features of an economic thrust to cultural policy. Notice, though, the word donation, not investment. The Vancouver Arts Initiative report is concerned with the health of the arts community, and the contribution of that healthy arts community to a creative city. The authors acknowledge that "the city's vibrant creativity has been challenged by profound social and economic changes" (p. 1), however they view the phenomenal growth in terms of the strain it places on limited resources available to the arts community. The report's twenty-three recommendations are designed to protect and increase the resources available for the arts, rather than to configure the arts as a component in a wider conception of the city's health.

All of the studies I reviewed detailed the contributions of culture to economic development and city image and all invoked economic and city marketing justifications for public support of culture. Edmonton's 1994 report of the Mayor's Task Force on Investment in the Arts is a good example of a policy emphasizing economic justifications. No talk of subsidy here; the title itself conveys the economic focus of this cultural policy: Building creative capital--An investment plan for the arts in Edmonton. The task force examined "how the arts work in Edmonton, and, perhaps more important, how the arts work for

Edmonton" (Edmonton, 1994b, p. 1; italics in the original). Task force members found that "Edmonton has created a name for itself as a centre for artistic excellence" and that "this profile will only grow as our investment in the arts sector strengthens" (Edmonton, 1994a, p. 7). The task force stressed that "the economy benefits enormously from the arts, as the arts sector creates jobs, injects money into local coffers, helps to retain and attract residents and businesses, draws tourists, is an engine of municipal revitalization and gives the city its identity" (Edmonton, 1994b, p. 1). The report concludes that "renewed investment in the arts is one of the keys to Edmonton's future as a thriving city and as a centre for creativity, culture and commerce" (Edmonton, 1994b, p. 2). "Even the most basic strategic analysis," the task force contends, "suggests that the arts represent a sound investment for Edmonton: the arts are our comparative advantage, our source of strength, and our greatest asset relative to other cities" (Edmonton, 1994a, p. 6). That reads like a primer for economic justifications of cultural policy.

Looking beyond the language to the substance of the recommendations, we also find an economic thrust. The proposed arts funding council is to have strong links with public agencies, among them Economic Development Edmonton. In addition to providing funding recommendations and policy advice to city council, the Edmonton Arts Council will work with businesses, foundations and local authorities to broaden the funding base for the arts. The task force also recommends numerous strategies relating to business involvement, promoting Edmonton through its arts, and encouraging organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce and Business Revitalization Zones to support the arts sector. Other recommendations deal with increasing direct municipal investment in the arts, and maximizing indirect support for the arts through various means including the possibility of city council's providing incentives for the private sector to support the arts.

Because I live here, and serve as a director on the first elected board of the Edmonton Arts Council, I have had a close-up view of the EAC's progress over the past two years. We have received an increase in municipal funds for arts and festivals; we have changed the name of the grant program to the Community Investment Program; and we have formed partnerships with the private sector and other public agencies on many new initiatives including an arts awareness campaign, artists' housing, an arts district in the city centre, a same-day half-price ticket booth, and most recently an endowment fund from which to make grants for the first time to individual artists. In 1998, the EAC participated with the city and Economic Development Edmonton in a trade mission to Ottawa and Toronto that was designed to raise awareness of Edmonton as a tourism, convention, and business location by featuring its arts and cultural assets.

The Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) report repeats the economic justifications found in the Edmonton report. While detailing the social benefits of culture to the greater Vancouver region, the authors emphasize the many economic benefits and point out the links between the health and vitality of the nonprofit arts community and the flourishing of the commercial arts and culture sector, cultural industries, tourism, and even the "spill-over effects felt in a host of related fields . . . from advertising to fashion design to computer software development" (GVRD, 1997, p. 7). The changes in population, demographics and cultural diversity of the past decade are seen as part of a regional reality that needs to be addressed in a cultural plan, along with a shift in the regional economy toward information and services and the region's position as an international centre and Pacific Rim gateway. The authors also tie cultural planning to "building complete communities within a livable region," an objective of the GVRD. In the minds of the staff of GVRD's member municipalities, culture is integral to the social and economic health, vitality, and livability of the region.

What of the Toronto Arts Council's Cultural Equity report and CultureForce project? At first, one might be inclined to read the concern for equitable opportunities for artists of specific cultural communities as a throwback to

1970s policy concerns about social and political integration of marginalized groups. However, in its justification of equity and in its choice of processes for realizing same, the report and the subsequent CultureForce project seem to me to anticipate a fourth phase of cultural policy purposes posited by Bianchini.

A Fourth Phase of Cultural Policy?

A key purpose of this phase, as conceived by Bianchini (1993), is to link the debate on the future of cities as physical and economic entities to the debate on the future of citizenship and local democracy. A cultural policy which accomplished this purpose would "encourage immigrant communities and other disadvantaged social groups to demonstrate the relevance of their ideas, aspirations, skills and resources to the city's overall development" (Bianchini, 1993b, pp. 199-200). Such a policy would rest on a definition of culture as a way of life that integrates arts into other aspects of local culture and into the textures and routines of daily life in the city. It would also require rethinking assumptions about quality of life, "from a commodity to be marketed as an element of urban competitiveness, to quality of life determined by how residents relate to their city as a collective entity and how they participate in its public life" (1993b, p. 211). We would understand cities as cultural entities, having cultural and symbolic as well as economic, environmental, social and political dimensions. Cultural policy, to be effective, should have a positive impact on regeneration in all of these dimensions.

I see intimations of this fourth phase of cultural policy in two of the reports reviewed in the previous chapter. One is the Calgary Civic Arts Policy, with its concern for the civic project and the role of the arts in helping citizens adapt to and engage with change in the city. The opening sentence reads:

> A city's unique spirit and vitality are expressed in many ways, most notably though its arts, architectural and engineering accomplishments, its welcome abundance and stewardship of nature, the health of its neighbourhoods, and the degree of safety and care provided to its citizens. (Calgary, 1996, p. 1)

The arts keep good company in Calgary.

The policy begins, "The City of Calgary recognizes that the arts are, first and foremost, for Calgarians and are a necessity in any healthy society." The report's concluding comments reference the changes transforming every part of society, which can be a "positive force for progress [and] can also lead to confusion and sometimes fear" (p. 15). They continue:

> The arts are important to our society as they help us to deal with these changes; the arts explore who we are

> and provide us a glimpse of where we are going. The arts remind us of our humanity in these times of great technological advancement, whatever our society becomes in the next decade, the arts will assist us to prepare for it, if they have not already. (p. 15)

Albeit in a quite different way, Toronto's _Cultural equity_ report also addresses a vision of the city as a democratic realm where the contributions of all are germane. Author E. A. Julian (1992) asserts that adoption of cultural equity as the ultimate aim of all the policies and delivery of services will put the arts council "proactively into the struggle to develop a city based on principles of equity" (p. 3). CultureForce coordinator Sharon Fernandez (1994) recognized that the arts and culture community was dealing with "a complex social issue underlying a much larger social problem and cultural malaise. . . . Cultural equity is a matter of fairness and access; it is also a matter of public self-esteem, harmony and survival" (p. 2).

In offering an explanation for why CultureForce worked so well, evaluator Rita Fraticelli (1994) commented that "all activities fed the actual cultural process and were seen as intrinsic to it--for example, administration and research were not separate but a part of the programme" (p. 21). Also money was dispersed to heretofore underserved specific cultural communities. The amounts were small--most grants were between $5000 and $10,000--but money "flowed quickly and directly; . . . an enormous amount happened in a very short period of time" (p. 21). The program design was lean, efficient, close to the ground, and acknowledged and took advantage of the existing expertise. "There was an assumption that people knew what to do and only needed an opportunity" (p. 22). Two comments offered to the evaluator underscore distinctive features of CultureForce:

> This is your genuine article crosscultural work. It's not motivated by bureaucratic goals but by cultural aspirations and artistic vision. Somebody finally decided to stop telling people what they ought to be doing and let them get on with it for themselves.
>
> This isn't just culturally and socially smart, it's economically smart. This is how we should be investing in the future. The economic future of this city is in the kind of talent and ingenuity that's being developed in this programme. (Fraticelli, 1994, p. 13)

I would add that it is politically smart, too, in that marginalized groups are participating in the polity and "contributing their particular perspectives to help democratize and enrich the city's cultural policy and raise questions about the way the city functions and is designed" (Bianchini, 1993b, p. 206).

Cultural Planning as a Policy Approach

To this point, I have focused on the Bianchini's model of policy purposes; however, Bianchini is well known as a proponent of cultural planning. Cultural planning is described as "a mechanism for placing local cultural activity on the urban agenda in order to improve city life and the fabric of the built environment" (Stevenson, 1998, p. 100). Pivotal to the concept of cultural planning is the linking of the expressive arts to broader economic and social policies, such as public transport, roads, street lighting, urban safety and other issues and activities (Bianchini et al, 1988, p. 10). Cultural planning is well established in the United Kingdom and the United States, and has been applied in Australia (Stevenson, 1998) and Canada. However, some feel that cultural planning has not lived up to its claims. Edward Delgado, former chair of the European cultural research network CIRCLE, speaking to the founding colloquium of the Canadian Cultural Research Network in Ottawa in June 1997, offered the opinion that cultural planning was on the wane in Europe as a focus for analytical activity.

Cultural planning has been critiqued by Deborah Stevenson (1998), who contends it is flawed in several crucial respects. One is the extent to which cultural planning seems to emphasize the inner city and ignore the totality of urban space. Another is the extent to which a link is made between inner cities and what Stevenson considers simplistic notions of democracy and citizenship. Stevenson is concerned, too, that cultural planning takes as a given public-private partnerships and worries that economic and social goals may be undermined as a result. Finally, Stevenson identifies in the rhetoric and assumptions of cultural planners a nostalgic and romantic view of urbanism which she fears may subvert many of the claims made for cultural planning. In Agendas in place: Urban and cultural planning for cities and regions, Stevenson documents her experience of the Honeysuckle Project in New South Wales and shows how the limitations of cultural planning were manifested in the project planning process.

Stevenson offers some starting points for addressing the weaknesses she has identified in cultural planning. She affirms as a strength of cultural planning its focus on the local but calls for a reanalysis of the relationship between the local and other levels of government, and between the state and civil society (p. 123). Such a reanalysis would yield conceptions of the state as contingent and vulnerable (p. 142), and conceptions of civil society as dynamic and fluid alliances formed around issues. By moving away from "urban social movements, protest and collective associations per se" (p. 137) we can construct a new model for understanding participation, one which is not simply a throwback to a golden age of participatory democracy such as we imagine was achieved in the 1970s, which seems to Stevenson to be at the root of cultural planning notions of consultation.

Stevenson challenges such a romanticized view of participatory democracy on several grounds. Chief among them is her observation that the balance of forces between civil society and the state has not appreciably changed as a result of the practice of participatory democracy during the 1970s. Additionally, Stevenson questions the validity of the political philosophy of pluralism, seeing two fictions: the neutrality of state as arbiter between competing interests, and the notion that interests are or can be evenly balanced and equally resourced. Stevenson questions the claim that existing collectives are necessarily democratic, pointing out that they sometimes replicate the distortions of representation characteristic of the wider society. Lastly, Stevenson wonders about the terrain beyond that covered by existing collectives, especially when the collectives embrace or are assigned a reactive or protest stance.

A new model of participation, for Stevenson, requires a new notion of citizenship which incorporates the "multiplicity of interests and identities of a diverse civil society" (p. 137). She asks of policy production:

> [I]s it possible for interest groups other than those

> of business and commerce to shape urban policy in a more direct way; the formulation of what mechanisms of mediation would enable governments to become more aware of the diverse needs and interests of a broader cross section of civil society than is presently the case. (p. 137)

I will return to these questions in my discussion of envisioning as a policy approach.

The Canadian Experience

Susan Phillips (1991) examines recent Canadian experiences of involving multiplicities of interests and identities in governmental policy-making and implementation. Phillips identifies a trend away from interest-based advocacy and policy criticism to an emphasis on service delivery and implementation. Evidence of this is a decrease in funding to interest groups, with the exception of those whose nature and mandate confirm the government's agenda for Canadian identity (for example, native groups and multicultural groups) and the move toward government-initiated partnerships. Partnership is defined by Phillips as "collaborative joint action in an effort to solve a problem" (p. 206), in contrast to consultation, which is an exchange of information.

Phillips describes and illustrates four types of partnership, each with varying degrees of autonomy and authority. A consultative partnership is different from a one-off consultation in that it endures over time, and has a chance to build trust, commitment and expertise. Members are carefully selected as typical of a particular stakeholder interest, rather than a specific organization. Phillips sees consultative partnerships as a new name for advisory committees, since they are given no new powers and are limited to exchanging information and providing advice. Contributory partnerships are designed to lever new money; they often result in greater understanding of an issue, and work well for a specific issue when partners agree on what must be done. Community development partnerships have as their purpose the cultivation of financial and human resources at the community level so that they can deliver services locally which are customized to a locality. These partnerships have some decision-making authority. Underlying them is an acknowledgement that "policies themselves do not necessarily produce social change" (p. 209); rather, empowerment that comes from the process of policy formulation and implementation may effect change. Collaborative partnerships involve power sharing and active participation by major social players who develop policy consensus in a broad field. Again, the participants are carefully selected individuals. Phillips considers collaborative partnership to be mechanisms which merge representation and policy intervention in the same organization. Phillips speculates as to whether collaborative partnerships constitute a form of corporatism, albeit ad hoc, in that they are new forms of state intervention. However, she feels that collaborative partnerships are "partial and tendential, rather than sector-wide and persistent" (1991, p. 210), and therefore untypical of corporatism.

In examining reasons for the federal government's shift from consultation to collaboration in partnerships, Phillips identifies some recent developments in the way government deals with interest groups. Not only are existing consultation processes viewed as unworkable, but also "faith has faded in the idea that government funding to public interest groups would create a level playing field among groups and promote citizenship in general" (1991, p. 184). These shifts in relationships with interests groups are consequences of changes in the structure of Canadian society. Phillips identifies three such changes: "increasing fragmentation and specialization of interests and identities, . . . giv[ing] voice to a multiplicity of collective identities as well as to very specific interest group claims" (p. 185-186); entitlement and a rights-oriented political culture, a result of the enshrining of individual and collective rights in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms; and a "growing uneasiness with elitism and increasing unwillingness to leave policy to our elected leaders" (pp. 186). Each of these changes has consequences for the policy process: political discourse is more complex as a result of the multiplicity of interests and identities, each collectivity feels a right to be heard in the policy process, and there is a desire that government decision-making processes be more open and participatory for all citizens.

Consultation in such a climate gives rise to certain challenges, to which the partnership mode is a response. The basic problem, according to Phillips, is "to reconcile divergent opinions into a single report that can be a useful input into policy-making" (p. 193). Citizen groups can be perceived as offering only criticism, rather than concrete policy alternatives. And in contrast to elite accommodation, or to public consultation involving professional lobbyists, citizen groups may be awkward and unprofessional in presenting their points of view. Ensuring the participation of a broad spectrum of intervenors--not just those who are organized and equipped to participate and those who are clients of a particular service under review--is a challenge. Avoiding unrealistic expectations, budgeting both time and money to conduct adequate consultations at appropriate points in policy development, and getting government to act on the input are perennial challenges of public consultation, perhaps exacerbated by the multiplicity of interests and identities wanting to participate. While policy partnerships are a partial response to these concerns, Phillips worries that the long range effect may be "to truncate or obscure the range of interest representation and public criticism" (p. 211).

Phillips is examining the relationship between government, particularly the national government in Canada, and interest groups involved in policy development. Phillips, Stevenson and Bianchini all assume that the state is a player in policy development and implementation. Lars Carlsson (1996) probes the possibility that the state may not be a player, and proposes a phenomenological approach to policy analysis in which the involvement of the state is to be discovered rather than assumed.

A Nonhierarchical Approach to Implementation Analysis

Carlsson's enquiry deals with the study of policy implementation, insofar as it can be distinguished from the study of policy-making or the evaluation of policy outcomes.[11] The implementation process is defined as "[t]hose actions by public or private individuals (or groups) that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions" (VanMeter & Van Horn, 1975, p. 445). A top-down model of policy implementation presupposes the existence of a policy, and seeks to explain "shortfalls" in the full realization of that policy by looking at the machinery of its implementation and the linkages among organizations in the "implementation chain" (Ham & Hill, 1987, p. 97). Problems with a top-down model (Ham & Hill, 1987, pp. 97-106) have led to development of a bottom-up stance for the study of implementation (Ham & Hill, 1987). This is the academic lineage of Carlsson, which includes Hjern and his associates (Hjern & Porter, 1981; Hjern & Hull, 1982) who argue for a methodology in which "researchers construct empirically the networks within which field-level decision-making actors carry out their activities without pre-determining assumptions about the structures within which these occur" (Ham & Hill, 1987, p. 107). For Carlsson, the relevance of formal political institutions to the policy process is part of what needs to be proved, not taken for granted. In a dynamic multi-actor society, "it cannot in fact be presupposed that formal political hierarchies are relevant to the problem being studied" (Carlsson, 1996, p. 531; emphasis in the original).

To this end, Carlsson proposes a four-part analytical typology to display the relationship between formal hierarchy and the looseness or tightness of the administrative arrangements operating in various spheres of politics (1996, p. 533). Case one is a hierarchy and a tightly coupled administrative system; that is, an administrative system characterized by central coordination, frequent exchanges between units, and formal rules to regulate activities. Carlsson considers this reflective of the normative model of political governance. Case two is a nonhierarchy and a tightly coupled administrative system; the example given by Carlsson is quasi-autonomous nongovernmental organizations (quangos). Case three is a hierarchical system loosely coupled, in which formal institutions "establish chains of action alongside or sometimes contrary to formal paths of action" (1996, p. 533) as with school boards, for example. Case four is nonhierarchy, loosely coupled, in which people combine efforts for the purpose of solving some emergent problem, sometimes without the assistance of formal political institutions.

It is this fourth case where Carlsson proposes to locate "implementation structures." An implementation structure is defined as "people trying to solve a common policy problem" (1996, p. 533). In this view, policy creation is seen as being

> due to acting individuals, not to metaphysically "acting wholes," that is, organizations. Some are acting through "their" organization (e.g. they can draw on its economic resources), others on behalf of their own in order to solve some policy problem. Together, however, they are forming a structure which is understandable only with reference to the problem to be solved. (Carlsson, 1996, p. 537)

These implementation structures, also named by Carlsson as "concrete systems of action" (1996, p. 540), become the subject of a nonhierarchical approach to implementation analysis.

The questions to be asked, then, by a policy analyst are:

> 1. What is (are) the problem(s) to be solved?
> 2. Who is participating in the creation of institutional arrangements in order to solve them? (1996, p. 535; emphasis in the original)

Carlsson contends that by asking these questions a researcher can construct from available data the implementation structures engaged in producing policy. This approach does not presuppose a prior policy which is now being implemented, nor does it presuppose the relevance or even the presence of the state as a participant in policy production. It blurs the boundaries between policy-making and policy implementation. If policy "may really only emerge through an elaborate process that can include those stages which are conventionally described as implementation" (Ham & Hill, 1987, p. 101), then I am inclined to ask if Carlsson's approach to policy analysis might be inverted and so constitute an element of an approach to policy production where the implementation structures, that is groups of acting individuals who are trying to solve a policy problem, may be invited to come into being for purposes of policy making-and-implementation. This is one way of viewing the envisioning approach to policy described in the next chapter.

Cities and Political Space

While Carlsson challenges us to discover rather than presuppose the relevance of the state to policy production on any given occasion, Magnusson (1996) urges a reconsideration of cities as sites for political action on the basis, paradoxically, of their ambiguous and contingent statehood. Cities, according to Magnusson, are the nexus where social movements and locality intersect and interact. It is where people move outside of their everyday activities to see themselves not as passive subjects but as citizens making wider political claims. In so doing, they "lay claim to a political space that may or may not conform to the spaces allowed by the existing system of government" (Magnusson, 1996, p. 10). The political space of the municipality then is "of the people, but not; of the state, but not; of society, but not; of the locality, but not" (p. 10). In Magnusson's view, that political space is not dominated and cannot be dominated by a single entity with a sovereign will and is not understandable in terms of only one set of claims or one account of reality. Instead of holding a view of cities as weak and flawed versions of a sovereign state, Magnusson offers a view of cities as paradigmatic; their fragile, contingent, limited and dependent nature is the emerging reality for states in a global world. In effect, he asks us to consider the possibility that municipalities are not the state writ small, but that states are municipalities writ large; and indeed that the city is the hologram of the emerging global political order.

Are there some implications for policy-making flowing from Magnusson's view of the city as a paradigmatic site for political action? Magnusson identifies several aspects of the search for political space which speak to me of approaches to policy production. One is the multiplicity of players and concerns to be engaged in any policy process:

> [W]e cannot locate ourselves in relation to just one world and just one history; instead we have to come to terms with the multiplicity of worlds and histories--spaces and times--that make up the political conditions we face. (1996, p. 7)

This multiplicity of worlds and histories will give rise to multiple scenarios, multiple solutions, possibilities rather than imperatives, for "it is in considering claims in relation to one another that we begin to see the connections between problems, the commonalities in the solutions" (Magnusson, 1996, p. 114). And those solutions will be practical and concrete, rather than theoretical and abstract: "the political possibilities of the present . . . have to be understood in terms of the concrete activities in which people are engaged" (1996, p. 8).

Magnusson draws a parallel between identity-construction at the personal and the state levels:

> In personal life, the sealed identity is the functional equivalent of the state. . . . [I]t is a fixation that can obstruct the practices that are required to secure people's objectives. Creative politics depends on opening up sealed identities and forming new possibilities. (1996, p. 113)

Magnusson also cautions against supplanting one set of sovereignty-thinking with another. He asks

> whether we can constitute our activities without reifying them; give them form and presence while ensuring that they don't become things that dominate our lives; open possibilities without foreclosing our means to reconstitute our activities in accordance with our changing needs and desires. (1996, p. 101)

Magnusson's call is for new political spaces and new ways of doing politics, where ordinary people can engage locally with global issues.

The writers whose work I have referenced in this chapter are challenging, on different fronts, accepted practices and understandings of policy production in urban municipalities at the close of the millennium. To recap: Bianchini poses questions about how residents relate to their city as a collective entity and how they participate in its public life; Stevenson calls for a new model of participation, requiring a new notion of citizenship which incorporates the multiplicity of interests and identities of a diverse civil society; Phillips challenges us to discover new modes of participation which generate concrete policy alternatives without reducing the range of public criticism; Carlsson posits new relationships between citizens and the state in a nondivisible task of policy making-and-implementation; and Magnusson seeks ways to open, and hold open, new political spaces for action at the local level.

If these challenges and the associated opportunities are valid, then I see openings for alternative policy processes based on emerging propositions about locality, identity, citizenship, and culture. My experiences over the past fifteen years with envisioning as a policy process suggest to me that envisioning may constitute an approach to policy production in contemporary Canadian cities which responds to some of the issues raised by Bianchini, Stevenson, Phillips, Carlsson, and Magnusson. I turn, now, to a description of envisioning, its practices, principles, and contexts.

Chapter 4

Envisioning

Envisioning is an approach to policy planning and action developed by Warren Ziegler at the Educational Policy Research Centre at Syracuse University in 1970 and refined by him over the past thirty years (Ziegler, 1994). Envisioning has been applied by Ziegler and others in a variety of settings, including public policy settings. In this chapter, I describe envisioning, its practices, principles and applications, including its application as a public policy process. I identify four characteristics of envisioning which seem to me to distinguish it from typical approaches to policy, and which may begin to address some of the issues and challenges raised by the writers whose work I reviewed in the preceding chapter.

As I have come to understand it, envisioning is a coherent set of interconnected practices undertaken by groups of self-selecting persons in response to their concerns and with an intent to take action to address those concerns. Envisioning proceeds by a series of questions, to which envisioners seek sound responses within themselves by means of specific practices. Participants use these same practices to offer their individual responses to one another as a basis for seeking collectively to build a shared vision of the future, and to discover the action they will take in the present to realize the imagined future. Threaded through the sequential activities is an ongoing process of collective reflection designed to help participants constitute themselves as a community of learners independent of the facilitator, sponsors, etc.

The Envisioning Questions

Eight questions give sequential shape to the envisioning work. The questions are invitations to participants to probe their own experiences, feelings, ideas, and intentions, first individually and then in self-selected groupings. These questions emerged through trial and error as Ziegler sought, first in graduate seminars and then in direct work with citizens, to help people move beyond disembodied planning into probing their own experiences and responses on matters of importance to them.

The questions are:

1. What are you concerned or dissatisfied about in the present? The output of this phase of envisioning for each participant is a clear priority concern that she will use for her subsequent imaging.
2. What are some of the characteristics and features of a future in which your concerns have been well addressed? The output of this phase of envisioning for each participant is one or more individual images of a future in which her concern has been well addressed, however she defines well addressed.

3. What is the compelling kernel of this image of the future which you are prepared to offer to others? The output of this phase of envisioning for each participant is one image selected from her individual images of the future that she is prepared to describe on a poster, offering it to others as an account of a future on behalf of which she is prepared to take action.

4. To which images of the future offered by other participants does yours connect such that you judge you could create a shared vision which has fidelity to your individual images? The output of this stage of envisioning is the formation of self-selecting teams of persons who judge they can work together to create a scenario of a shared future.

5. What is a scenario of your shared future which you are collectively prepared to offer to the world? The output of this phase of envisioning is a detailed scenario of a future which the team members share and on behalf of which they are prepared to take action.

6. How did your shared future come about; that is, what history connects it back to the present? The output of this phase of envisioning is a futures-history of the team's scenario.

7. What are the pivotal points in your futures-history at which you can take action to realize some important aspect of your future in the ongoing present? The output of this

phase of envisioning is identification of opportunities for enacting one or more aspects of the shared vision of the future.

8. What action can/will you take to unfold some important aspect of your future in the present? With what resources? On what timelines? With what other players? The output of this phase of envisioning is action plans, including self-assignments, for enacting the future vision in the ongoing present. In a policy project, some or all of the actions might be policy formulation.

This sequence of questions provides the task focus for the work of participants in an envisioning endeavour. By themselves, these questions do not constitute an approach significantly different from most planning exercises. However, in envisioning, responses to these questions are sought by participants first within themselves and then among groupings of participants by means of a specific set of practices or disciplines designed explicitly to bring the imaginative and spiritual capacities of envisioners to bear on their concerns and actions, capacities that are not always engaged or honoured by planning processes.

The Envisioning Practices

Envisioners are invited to practise particular approaches to questioning, listening, imaging, learning, discerning, intentioning, and dialogue. These particular practices are named by Warren Ziegler as the disciplines of deep questioning, deep listening, deep imaging, deep learning, discerning, intentioning and dialogue. They are characterized by an attentiveness to one's inner voice, to what is worthiest within one, to what Ziegler has come to call the human spirit. By this naming he is invoking not a religious concept, but the quality or aspect of ourselves which we might recognize as the depth dimension of our human experience, a dimension we share with all other persons, and which in our best moments guides us into paths of thought and action which are life-giving and beneficent. The envisioning disciplines do not stop with the individual dimension but issue forth into dialogue with others similarly engaged and thereby compel us to consider the consequences of our acting in the world.

Deep questioning is a practice of probing one's lived experience for the discontinuities that indicate some disharmony between the world as it is and the world as we sense it could be, or our lives as we are living them and the life we long for. Deep questioning queries the status quo, and asks What is going on? Why? and In what way am I contributing to the problem which distresses me? It examines assumptions, beliefs, values, habits, and attitudes held by the envisioner which may not be, or may no longer be, life-giving to oneself or others. Deep questioning one's self is a practise for uncovering concerns, dissatisfactions, pain, and even fear; it is the means by which an envisioner arrives at the focus for subsequent imaging of a future in which his concerns have been well addressed. Deep questioning between envisioners is a practice for clarifying concerns, images, or actions and for identifying images that are in conflict, in which case further imaging is invited.

Deep listening is a mode of listening to one's self and to others. In deep listening, a listener is invited to empty herself of all concerns, images, expectations, fears, and hopes, and to receive that which flows from the source to which she is listening, whether that be her inner self or another person. Deep listening begins with being silent, and being silence for the speaker (self or other), inviting the talker to hear herself in new ways. Deep listening requires full attention; it suspends judgement (of oneself or another); it is empathic; and, in its best moments, it nurtures the questing or the vision of the speaker into greater fullness and clarity. This mode of listening has nothing in common with active listening, mirroring and other communication strategies; it is rather a radical emptying of self in order to offer a nonshaping vessel to receive the still-forming explorations of the other. Ziegler codified this mode of listening from an activity referenced in the fourth century B.C.E. writings of Chuang Tzu (Watson, 1968). Deep listening is a component of every phase of envisioning, done sometimes by oneself, sometimes with others in pairs, in scenario groupings and as a community of learners.

Deep imaging is a practice in which participants generate alternative images or stories to the ones they are now living. Deep imaging is a creative, imaginative activity which has the capacity to generate newness, to bring into being in the imagination a new state of affairs which does not yet exist in the world of the imager. In this generative aspect it is not unlike the creative act of the artist. Something new takes shape in the imagination, something which does not now exist and which is more than a rearrangement of existing components or a straight-line extrapolation of a present condition. Deep imaging is an activity different from logic or reasoning; not superior to them, but an alternative which is seldom considered as the basis for public policy work. Images cannot be forced; rather they are invited out of oneself in response to a concern one holds and a hope that something else is possible. The capacity to image is a human capacity and therefore open to all; like all disciplines, imaging is learned by the doing of it. Individual images are the raw material of the remainder of the envisioning process; imag_ing_ is the generative activity practised, individually and collectively, whenever new or additional material is needed or wanted.

Deep Learning is not a practice I explicitly invite in envisioning, although it often occurs spontaneously as people confront and surmount assumptions or habits of thought or worldviews which have constrained them within boundaries of the-way-things-are and the-way-the-world-works. Deep learning involves discovering a new mode of self in which past constraints dissolve and new possibilities open to the learner. I often name this self-learning because I experience it as my self discovering or learning another possible state of being, degree of fullness, or range of possibility previously closed to me by my self-definition or preconceived ideas. Deep learning is often a consequence of practising deep questioning, deep listening and deep imaging. When it occurs, it liberates the envisioner to generate and offer images that cannot be accounted for in terms of one's life experiences to date, but which emerge from a source beyond one's social biography.

Discerning is a way of discovering among one's images those that are compelling, that have the power to move one to action on their behalf. The practice of discerning is akin to using one's inner self, the depth dimension of one's experience, as a tuning fork with which to metaphorically strike each image, and by listening to the sound, come to know which ones ring true with one's deepest aspirations and worthiest intentions. Discerning is applied to one's own images, to those offered by others, and to those generated collectively by a scenario grouping, as well as to opportunity sightings and actions. It begins in individual activity and moves to the collective mode where all seek to test ideas against an emerging group concern, vision, or action.

Intentioning is a further application of questioning, listening, imaging, and discerning, practised in order to discover where and when one is willing to take action on behalf of one's own images and shared scenarios. Intentioning is a way of constituting oneself as an active agent in the world and engaging with others who are so constituting themselves. Intentioning is a way of discovering one's response to the question, So what? in the face of images of potential but not yet owned action.

Dialogue is envisioners practising the disciplines collectively in service of their shared vision. Dialogue occurs when two or more envisioners meet spirit-to-spirit in exploring their concerns, images, and actions. By spirit-to-spirit, I mean that they make themselves vulnerable to each other, eschewing the normal protections offered by social protocols and personality, and open the inner or depth experience of their humanness, each to the other, in order to explore and discover new capacities within themselves and new, fuller possibilities for their action in the world.

There is an additional practice in envisioning, not named by Ziegler as a discipline, which nevertheless constitutes an integral part of envisioning. Praxis is the practice of pausing at intervals throughout the envisioning to reflect together on their practising of the disciplines. Three standard praxis questions invite participants to describe, name, and own their own experiences of envisioning and so take charge of their own work and learning. The questions, asked of every practice and at each stage, are:

1. What is it like to do this practice?
2. What am I/are we doing when I/we do this?
3. Why do this?

Naming, describing, and giving an account of one's own experiences enables participants to claim the aspects of envisioning they are taking into themselves and use their own experience of the learning and doing of envisioning to challenge any facilitator dominance.

Principles Undergirding Envisioning

Envisioning, as Warren Ziegler has codified it, is primarily a set of practices. The practices however, embody a coherent set of ideas and principles concerning human nature, and individual and collective action. While the principles are familiar from a number of fields, including adult education and humanistic psychology, the closest parallel I have encountered is the work of Paolo Freire

(1970) and his concept of conscientization. In fact, Freire himself made this connection when he visited the Educational Policy Research Centre at Syracuse University in 1971-72, while Ziegler was the Co-director. In talking with a graduate student who was doing his doctoral dissertation using some of Ziegler's concepts and practices, Freire observed that Ziegler's futures-invention approach to civic literacy was for the American middle-class what his (Freire's) literacy training was for the rural peasantry in Latin America: it emancipated their intentionality as citizens (W. Ziegler, personal communication, June 3, 1999).

Since the principles on which envisioning rests are embodied in the practices and process, they will already be evident from the description above. However, I will review them briefly in order to make explicit some of the tensions involved in applying envisioning to public policy purposes.

Perhaps the most immediately noticeable principle undergirding envisioning is the use of the metaphor of the future to focus participants' creative work of generating alternatives to what now exists (for which we use the metaphor of the present). Most often, the future is understood as existing in time; however, increasingly groups of envisioners conceive of the domain of imaged alternatives as existing in space; that is, in another domain coexistent in time with the present. Either way in envisioning invitations, the future functions as a metaphor for what the human imagination can conceive, what is worthiest and best in us, which we want to offer and help to enact in our immediate world. The future as metaphor helps to liberate the envisioner temporarily from the imperatives of the present and the status quo, in order to entertain new possibilities.

When the future is understood as residing within the envisioner, it follows that each person is her own expert on her own future. The facilitator or sponsor of the envisioning project is not an expert on the future and cannot dictate to the envisioner what is and is not possible, what is and is not probable, what is and is not practical since these now become judgements the envisioner makes about her own intentions. Each person is her own expert on her concern--why she holds it, what it feels like, why it is a concern, and so on. The data for the envisioning process is not external to the envisioners, but within them.

Envisioning, then, is a process of each person's uncovering or discovering within himself the specific motivations for envisioning, the images he is prepared to offer, with whom he might create a shared vision, what his contribution will be to enacting the future in the present. The discovery learning is engaged in individually and collectively. Frequent praxis validates this learning in both the process and content dimensions of envisioning which are, in any case, nonseparable.

Discovery learning cannot be forced, only participated in by those who elect to do so. Therefore envisioning is always by invitation and self-selection. The key requisite for participation is the intention to participate. Credentials, status, role, position, and other external qualifiers are irrelevant to the type of learning and activity invited by envisioning, which is undertaken by persons by virtue of their personhood. This principle runs so counter to norms of public policy involvement that careful discernment is required on the part of sponsors and the facilitator when applying envisioning to public policy purposes. I will return in Chapter 7 to the political issues raised when a process involving self-selection is introduced into a domain in which representativeness is necessarily important.

Envisioning is participatory. It is in the doing of the practices that they are learned and outcomes are arrived at. The practices require no particular credentials, status, or previous experience although invitations to the practices may need to be customized culturally. We are all potentially capable of the practices, since listening, questioning, imaging, learning, discerning, intentioning and dialogue are all human capacities.

The motivation of envisioners is intrinsic and derives from two conditions: dissatisfaction and hope. The person who would accept the invitation to envision a future which is in some significant way different from the present must have some dissatisfaction with the present. If a person were completely content with the way things are, he would not need to consider any alternatives or generate any alternatives of his own. One of my envisioning colleagues renders this prerequisite in elegant language when he refers to those who accept the invitation to envision as "concern-bearers".[12] The second condition that motivates envisioners is hope that something other than what now is is possible. Without the possibility that something other than the status quo is achievable, no person would have reason to invest the energy required to generate those other possibilities.

Envisioning also seeks to have each person, and a community of learners collectively, take charge of their own learning. Both the material generated by participants (concerns, images, intentions, actions) and the means of generating them must be owned by the participants in order to protect against the possibilities of others (sponsor, facilitators, other participants) appropriating the imaging space of the envisioner. Through reflecting together on their own learning, in praxis, participants come to own the practices and principles of envisioning, to the extent that these fit for them, and to own their concerns, images, intentions, and actions.

Varieties of Formats and Contexts

As a set of practices with which any person or persons might engage, envisioning is not dependent on any prescribed structure and may take a variety of formats. In a policy context, a project format is most likely; however, before describing and giving examples of project formats, I would like to sketch out some other formats and contexts for envisioning. My purpose is to emphasize that envisioning is a set of practices applicable across a wide variety of formats and contexts, guided by the intentions and imagination of the envisioners.

First of all, the envisioning disciplines may be practised to some degree by an individual for purposes of personal growth, life guidance, problem solving, or as preparation for participation in public or organizational activities. The focus of one's envisioning work might be private; that is, involving concerns which are known only to themselves; or public, that is, involving them in the world. The occasions for personal envisioning are chosen by the individual envisioner and require no coordination with others. This mode of envisioning does not offer the richness and reality testing which come from envisioning with others, and it was not offered by Ziegler so much as it was taken up by envisioners for whom the practices learned in a community context were sufficiently powerful that they wanted to incorporate them into their ongoing personal learning journeys.

Envisioning may be undertaken by a group of persons gathering to practise the disciplines of envisioning with respect to their individual concerns. In this application of envisioning, there is not necessarily a shared area of concern; what participants hold in common is the desire to engage their concerns and discover their images via the envisioning practices. Members of such a group seldom develop shared images of the future or shared action. They assist one another in their individual work of identifying concerns, generating images, discerning intention, and coming to individual action. This might be understood as a support group rather than a scenario team. Even though the focus of the work is not shared, each participant has others with whom to undertake her personal deep listening, deep questioning, imaging, discerning, intentioning, and dialogue. The essential aspect of community is present in this application of envisioning, even though participants do not share a common area of concern, a shared vision, or joint action. I have been part of such a group, meeting fortnightly for six years now. Groups which assemble to be introduced to and learn the practices of envisioning are similar in that they have in common a focus on the envisioning practices and do not share a focus of concern or action. Here the participants don't initially know one another; however, they form community for the duration of the workshop, providing the context for learning and practising the disciplines of envisioning with one another. Generally workshops are concentrated into two- or three-day periods. I have facilitated envisioning workshops sponsored privately and by educational institutions.

In another application of envisioning, an existing group chooses to envision in response to a shared concern and shared impetus to action. These groups might be governments or government departments (national, provincial, local), corporations, churches, not-for-profit groups, professional associations, or informal affiliations. The focus of their work might be organizational renewal, professional development, long range planning, policy development, or team building. Each occasion suggests its own format, which may range from a single three-day intensive session, sometimes residential; to two, two-day sessions separated by a few days or several months; to a series of evening sessions extending over a period of years; or any other format that fits for the group, the facilitators, and the logistics.[13] I have facilitated envisioning with all of these different types of groups, with these various focuses, and in these and other formats. Although some things are gained and lost in each format, no format I have tried has proved unworkable. The format is less determinative than the intentions of the participants and the practising of the disciplines.

Projects: A Specific Application of Envisioning

In addition to the personal practising of the envisioning disciplines by an individual, the coming together of a group to learn or practise the disciplines of envisioning, or the selecting of envisioning as an approach to a concern shared by an existing group, there is a fourth occasion--the envisioning project.

In an envisioning project, a shared focus of concern is identified by a sponsor, who then invites persons to participate in envisioning the future of this shared focus of concern. The focus and the approach are predetermined by the sponsor; the invitation is broadly extended; and persons select themselves to participate in the project. The criteria for self-selection are: having a concern or dissatisfaction with respect to the area of focus and having the intention to participate. The group is thus constituted by those who declare themselves concerned about the particular focus and committed to addressing their concerns through envisioning. In an envisioning project, the sponsor and the facilitator generally work out in advance logistics concerning format: number and duration of envisioning gatherings, lapsed time between gatherings, mechanics of producing and exchanging written accounts of the envisioning work among participants, etc. However, the sponsor and the facilitators can neither predetermine nor preclude the content or outcomes of the envisioning work to be done by participants.

An example of an envisioning project undertaken on a national scale was the Cultural Leadership Development Project (CLDP), sponsored by the Centre for Cultural Management at the University of Waterloo. The focus for the project was the future of culture in Canada, particularly with regard to cultural leadership and the learning needs of cultural leaders. Nearly 350 self-described cultural leaders elected to participate at eleven sites across six provinces. Initially the envisioning was done face-to-face at the eleven sites; however, eventually envisioning was carried on at a distance, using computer conferencing supplemented by audio teleconferencing. We discovered, through two pilots of a prototype distance learning opportunity, not only that veteran envisioners could practise the envisioning disciplines at a distance using various communications technologies, but that novices could also learn and engage the envisioning practices at a distance (Cultural leadership inside out, 1995).

Since, in envisioning projects, the sponsor and facilitators can neither guarantee nor preclude outcomes, there is a high degree of risk and trust involved in an organization's deciding to invite persons to envision around a shared area of concern. This openness can be a stumbling block for hierarchical organizations, especially so when the project addresses public policy concerns. Despite this very significant caveat, envisioning has been used as a public policy process on a number of occasions in a variety of settings with diverse focuses by Warren Ziegler, me and others.

Envisioning Policy Projects

In 1980 Warren Ziegler and Dr. Elise Boulding, then Chair of the Department of Sociology at Dartmouth University, designed, organized and introduced a worldwide program called "Imaging a World Without Weapons," sponsored by numerous churches, academic groups, and peace groups, including the United Nations Disarmament Fellows.

Five years earlier, the governor of the state of Washington initiated a state-wide program entitled "Citizens Alternatives for Washington." Conducted by the Brookings Institution of Washington, D.C., with Ziegler as project designer and lead facilitator, it involved about 35,000 citizens who in Saturday sessions critiqued and responded to a host of new public policies for the state envisioned by 150 citizens from all walks of life in two three-day residential workshops.

Since 1995, Ziegler has worked with the Swedish Association of Local Government Authorities to conduct a series of envisioning workshops and training sessions for local government officials, public and private organizations, and concerned professionals to help them apply the envisioning approach to local problems in sustainable development and to other social and economic concerns throughout Sweden.

In 1988-90, Ziegler worked with the City of Richmond, Indiana (population 40,000) to update its twenty-year-old city plan. The elected planning commission and the city's planning department sponsored a long-term planning project involving over one hundred citizens in imaging a twenty-first-century Richmond in which their concerns were well addressed. Policy outcomes included new initiatives in "infrastructure, neighbourhoods, streets and highways, economic development, environment, parks and recreation, quality of life, police and fire, etc." (Ziegler, 1991, p. 517).

"Strathcona Tomorrow" was an equivalent Canadian project. During 1991-92, the County of Strathcona, Alberta, sponsored a policy project in which more than 120 residents participated in envisioning the future of the county, including the unincorporated, densely populated community of Sherwood Park. Policy outcomes were identified in the areas of local government and public involvement, land use, environment, economic development, community and social development, and education. A feature of "Strathcona Tomorrow" was the selection and preparation of twenty-five citizens as participant-facilitators who led the envisioning workshops in which their fellow residents contributed their visions for the future of the county.

In Edmonton, in 1988, an envisioning policy project was undertaken with a focus on culture. Over one hundred citizens developed policy initiatives in the areas of arts for social change, arts education, civic literacy, public spaces, cultural infrastructure, technology, life-long learning, neighbourhoods, and multiculturalism. The Edmonton Cultural Futures Project was designed by Ziegler; as a City of Edmonton staff person, I served as on-site project director. This represented my first experience of envisioning applied to a public policy purpose and my first involvement in a large-scale envisioning project. The Cultural Futures Project is described and analyzed in depth in the next chapter.

During 1995-96, the City of Kitchener, Ontario, involved fifty residents in developing a vision for culture in Kitchener. The Kitchener CulturePlan generated policy proposals and action plans dealing with festivals and celebrations, the downtown core, arts and learning, new facilities, communication, and the municipal role in creating an infrastructure for culture. The Kitchener project was my first major outing as a designer and facilitator of an envisioning policy project. It comprises the second case study for this thesis, and is described in Chapter 6.

Four Features Distinguishing Envisioning as a Public Policy Process

The remainder of this thesis explores the application of envisioning to public policy, especially public policy for culture. Four features of envisioning seem to distinguish it from typical approaches to policy formulation discovered in the five examples from Chapters 2 and 3. These features are:

1. Participants in an envisioning policy project select themselves in response to an open invitation rather than being selected and appointed by an existing policy hierarchy.

2. Policy issues to be addressed are determined by participants as part of their work together rather than being predetermined by the policy hierarchy.

3. A structured, imaginative, co-creative process is employed in an effort to make the leap from issues and concerns to new policy possibilities.

4. Policy formulation and implementation are considered to be conjoined, having the potential for autonomous action by participants on behalf of their visions; literally, self-authorizing action.

I will explore each of these features of envisioning policy projects in more depth in my concluding chapter. Of particular interest are the issues created when self-selection and citizen action are introduced into the domain of politics, where representation and state action are tenets of policy production in a democracy. However, if the challenges to, and opportunities for, present policy practices raised by Bianchini, Stevenson, Phillips, Carlsson, and Magnusson have any validity or potential, then perhaps we can entertain alternative approaches to public policy production which need not rely on assumptions of representation and state action. Envisioning may be such an alternative policy process. In one of the following two cases, the issues created when envisioning was applied to public policy purposes were successfully negotiated.

Chapter 5

The Cultural Futures Project, Edmonton

In this first of two case studies, I document the Cultural Futures Project in Edmonton in 1988. In this project, envisioning was used to develop what was intended to be a cultural policy for the city. Despite the potential of envisioning to be successfully applied to this end (as we shall see in the second case study), the Cultural Futures Project did not result in a cultural policy for the city. Following a description of the project structure and outcomes, I will offer my understandings, arrived at with the benefit of a decade of reflection and added experience, of the factors which contributed both to its successes and to its failures.

Background to the Project

When I joined the staff of the City of Edmonton in the fall of 1985, efforts at developing cultural policy had been under way for a number of years. Since 1978 Parks and Recreation Department staff, city-sponsored conferences on cultural policy, city-initiated task forces, and policy people in the community had prepared papers on cultural policy. Increasingly these efforts at consensus included multicultural as well as arts groups. In early 1986, a task force established by the mayor published its recommendations for a cultural commission, to be composed equally of arts representatives and multicultural representatives, which would allocate funding according to a formula, including a clause protecting the arts groups already receiving civic funding. As a member of the arts community, I helped organize the community's response to the proposed Cultural Commission during the summer of 1985. As I revisit those discussions now, I realize the arts community was protecting its ground (most of the city funding available to culture was distributed to arts groups) but also acknowledging validity in the new claims of multicultural groups, to whom a door had been opened by the recently elected mayor, Laurence Decore.

When I was hired as Director of Culture in the Parks and Recreation Department, my first task was to prepare a report for city council on the recommendations of the task force. All I recall of the discussions is my struggle to understand the dynamics of decision-making by city council. Rather than establishing the proposed cultural commission, council opted to revise the composition of the existing Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. This citizen group, already responsible for advising council on disbursement of grant-in-aid funds, would now include representation of multicultural groups, alongside the existing representation from arts groups and community leagues. No changes were made to the advisory board's processes for reviewing and recommending grants for recreational and cultural groups. A definition of multiculturalism was incorporated into the revised bylaw, and the word culture in the advisory board's name and mandate was now understood to include not just the arts, both amateur and professional, but ethnoculturally based activity as well. Concurrently with these changes, I changed the name of my division from Arts and Culture to Arts and Multiculturalism and created a position (the first of two) to work with multicultural groups. When we prepared an inventory of multicultural groups, they numbered between two and three hundred, about twice as many as the arts groups who had been exclusive recipients of city services to that point.

In the same year, the Government of Alberta prepared legislation to change the name of its department responsible for cultural development from Alberta Culture to Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism. Elsewhere, the Toronto Arts Council had just published Cultural capital, the Canadian Conference of the Arts was planning its 1987 conference on municipal cultural policy and, within two years, Arts and the Cities would be gathering data on cultural activity in twenty-six Canadian cities. During 1986, the federal government was reviewing no fewer than nine enquiries it had commissioned into the state of national cultural development. It was against this backdrop of change at all jurisdictional levels that city council requested, at the same meeting that approved the reconstituted advisory board, that "the Advisory Board bring forward a cultural policy in one year" (Edmonton: A city for the 21st Century, para. 1.5). This the advisory board set out to do. As the staff member with responsibility for culture, I was to assist them.

A Process for Developing Cultural Policy

As we considered how to go about our task, we were aware of the divisions within the community we were attempting to serve and of the perception that different sectors of the community were in competition for the same finite funds. We were also aware of policy exhaustion among those who had originated or responded to no fewer than ten local policy documents over the previous decade. I do not recall what other approaches we considered, if any; I know that the path on which we set foot would lead us to reexamine all of the recommendations from the previous policy documents. We discovered that:

> [M]ost of the recommendations pertained to the allocation of financial resources. Some recommendations addressed the governance questions of who would make the decisions in allocating financial resources. A few recommendations spoke to the value and importance of the arts or ethnocultural activity or recreation to the city and to the quality of life of

> its citizens. However there was an absence of any statements about the intended outcomes of allocating support to cultural development. (21st Century, para. 1.8; emphasis added)

When I reported these findings to the advisory board in a meeting early in 1987, we identified the problem as a lack of vision. We theorized that, without a vision from which the policies flowed, there was no reason for council to support cultural development, no motivation for council to act on the recommendations proffered. Whether correctly or not, we concluded that what we needed to do, in this round of cultural policy development, was to offer a vision of cultural development in Edmonton, to describe the kind of city Edmonton might become culturally. How to do this? In response to this question from an advisory board member, the chairman declared that this was the kind of assistance they expected from the professional staff. In a moment of decision that altered the course of my professional life, I chose to introduce the advisory board to the Futures-Invention approach to envisioning which I had just experienced. Subsequently, advisory board members met Warren Ziegler; together we designed a policy project to be called the "Cultural Futures Project," formed a cultural policy committee of the advisory board to oversee the project, and secured from city council both its permission and the resources needed to complete the year-long project.

I was seconded from the Parks and Recreation Department to serve as full-time project director.

We chose the envisioning process because we thought it would address some of the contextual issues we faced, as well as produce the results and outcomes we sought. Firstly, envisioning would produce the needed vision of the future of cultural development in Edmonton:

> The choice of an envisioning approach resulted from the Advisory Board's conviction that, for policies to be effective, there needed to be some shared conception of the desired future that those policies were designed to realize. (21st Century, para 8.1)

Secondly, envisioning would enlist all of the affected groups and factions in working and learning together as they developed vision and policy:

> The Advisory Board recognized the presence in Edmonton (as in every place) of many special interest factions, each with its competing claims but all of whom were important contributors to the total cultural development of the city. (21st Century, para 8.1)

Thirdly, envisioning would involve participants as persons--each with her or his particular and unique knowledge, concerns, and aspirations--and not as representatives of an affinity group with a predetermined agenda. This approach to policy would:

> go beyond merely inviting each group to make their

> separate claim on the future, but would encourage co-operative development of a shared future. (21st Century, para. 8.1)

Finally, for the policy weary, envisioning would offer a new process with new competencies to be learned; the prospect of coming to some new possibilities for culture in Edmonton; and at least the possibility that this time city council would honour their work by adopting the recommendations based, as these would be, on the heretofore missing ingredient: vision. So envisioning was selected as a process which would:

> honour the excellent work done over the previous ten years; involve those who had a stake in cultural development; build bridges of understanding among those groups and individuals; and result in genuinely new possibilities and actions for the city's cultural future. (21st Century, para. 1.6)

Although I find it difficult to fully appreciate the import of this in retrospect, I must emphasize that from the first mention of envisioning as a possible policy process in early 1987, through the design and approval stages, through the process of inviting participation and confirming arrangements, until the envisioning conference in March, 1988, no one had any idea of what visions might emerge. That is because vision was to be generated by participants, and the participants were to be whoever chose to become involved. Consequently, no one could predetermine project outcomes because no one could prescribe who would participate, what concerns they would bring, or what visions they would offer. Perhaps Ziegler had some notions, based on his work in other settings, but even when he offered us examples (which he did), city councillors, advisory board members, cultural policy committee members, and I all agreed to enter into a discovery process in which no outcomes could be either guaranteed or precluded. Looking back on it, I still find this a remarkable moment in public affairs. That the project was able to proceed--and citizens were given this opportunity to generate their visions for culture in Edmonton largely unencumbered by political intervention--is attributable in my mind to the presence of three persons in positions of responsibility all of whom were prepared to respect the wisdom of citizens engaged in honest exploration of the public good.[14] Having thus secured a truly open space for imaginative exploration of policy possibilities, we moved to extend the invitation to participate in such a way as to keep the space open for possibilities to emerge.

Inviting Participation

In previous policy excursions Edmonton, like other jurisdictions, had been accustomed to selecting and appointing those who would participate in policy development, either as contracted policy writers, or as volunteer members of a task force or advisory group. In the envisioning approach, however, participation is by self-selection. Rather than brainstorming names and narrowing down the list while carefully balancing all the requisite perspectives needing to be considered, our challenge was to distribute the invitation as widely as possible.

Faced with this unfamiliar challenge and perhaps still in our own minds believing we needed to cover off certain perspectives, the committee opted for a two-stage invitation process blending openness with representation. We identified twenty sectors of the community we felt had a stake in cultural development, from tourism to education to media. We wrote to key organizations in each sector asking them to identify persons involved in and knowledgeable about their sector who were concerned for the future of culture in Edmonton, and imaginative. The last criterion--imagination --was our way of signalling that we were looking for people who might engage policy development in a new way. The stakeholding organizations were invited to designate someone to take part, not in the envisioning, but in an initial meeting to identify concerns and to be introduced to the envisioning approach to policy development. Once assembled, the members of this initial group of participants were asked, as part of their work on concerns, to name others whom they saw as resources for cultural development. Invitations to participate in the envisioning conference were then sent to those named, plus others suggested by the advisory board and the cultural policy committee of the board. Close to three hundred invitations were distributed. The invitation was worded so as to be clear that the recipient was welcome to decline or to accept, based solely on an assessment of his own suitedness and intentions. It was not a summons or a request; it was a genuine invitation; that is, it could be refused.

Having come to this blended, two-stage approach to extending invitations, we then took two additional steps, one underscoring representativeness and one underscoring openness. On the one hand, we gave three umbrella organizations--the Edmonton Professional Arts Council, the Edmonton Multicultural Society, and the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues--the option of designating up to five participants each. On the other hand, we placed an advertisement in the largest circulation daily newspaper announcing that ten spaces were available for members of the public to participate. Nineteen applications were received (including four submitted by one particularly eager would-be participant), and ten were selected by a process of random number generation. All ten attended the envisioning workshop, and some of them became sustained contributors to the project.

Generating Images of Edmonton's Cultural Futures

Eighty people arrived for the two-day envisioning conference which was the centrepiece of the Cultural Futures Project. A city councillor and the advisory board chairman welcomed all participants and invited them to participate openly in the process. Warren Ziegler facilitated the workshop, assisted by volunteers who had envisioning experience.[15] Each participant was given a workbook of exercises prepared by Ziegler. Each participant had also received a copy of the concerns for cultural development in Edmonton articulated by representatives of the various stakeholder groups a month earlier.

Two introductory activities preceded the main work of generating individual images of the future. These two activities served to introduce the practices of envisioning, particularly deep listening and deep imaging, and also to help participants become aware of both the richness of their own cultural histories and of the assumptions, expectations, hopes, and fears about the future they carried within them. The first activity was worded as an invitation to one's self to "remember one or more experiences or events in your own cultural life and expression which were of significance or importance to you" (Ziegler, 1988, p. 4). A definition of culture was offered in the workbook:

> We employ the notion of cultural life, expression, and activity in a broad and deep sense, to include the

> practices through which persons, individually and in groups, give meanings to their deepest human needs and aspirations. Clearly, "art" . . . is central to this notion; but so too are recreation, leisure, civic, ethnic, community, and an infinite variety of symbolic activities. (Ziegler, 1988, p. 4)

Participants then shared their stories of cultural events, experiences, or needs of personal significance or importance to them in groups of six to eight people. A second introductory activity invited participants to ask themselves, "What do you carry inside yourself about the future? What are your assumptions, expectation, hopes and fears?" (Ziegler, 1988, p. 6). After a period of inner, reflective work, participants shared this material with a partner they didn't know, deep listening to one another's story-telling. By means of these two introductory activities, participants were introduced to the competencies of listening within, yielding to one's images, deep listening to another, and story-telling.

Following this preparation, participants were invited to generate their visions of a cultural future for Edmonton guided by the questions, "What could be, might be, should be the central features of Edmonton's cultural future? What activities, practices, expressions do you image for its cultural future?" (Ziegler, 1988, p. 11). They were coached to this inward search with phrases such as "yield, don't force," and "take a mindleap into the future . . . 20, 30, 40 years" (Ziegler, 1988, p. 11). After twenty minutes of inner, reflective work, participants were invited to share the images of the future they had uncovered within themselves with one or two partners, living the images in their imaginations as they recounted them to partners who were deep listening and questioning with an intent to help extend and clarify the images rather than judge or dismiss them. One purpose of such clarifying is to help the imager render judgements on her own images; that is, to discern their truth and desirability, and eventually to discern which ones compelled her to action on their behalf.

When researching this paper, I came across my own image from that session, recorded in my copy of the Workbook. The image was of:

> communities of ten to twenty "families" (quotation marks in the original) in which property is individually owned and persons earn wages. Each community has a matriarch (not always the same person) who attends to (draws attention of people to) their own needs and opportunities in the artistic/intellectual/social/spiritual/health/fitness dimensions. . . . These communities are centres for civic education--debate, discussion, learning to care and see things from other points of view. The enlightened citizens then participate in governance

> through referendums, elections, etc. These are not arenas for rule-making or enforcing but for self-development.

It is interesting to me to see that this image is about arenas of governance close to the people, that is, at the level of family groupings. Apparently I was beginning to grapple with questions of politics at that time. Certainly this first blush of an image focused not on the arts, although artistic concerns were included, but on wider questions of how we prepare ourselves to participate in the public realm.

From among the various images he had generated, each person was now invited to discern the one or ones which were compelling for him, and to make a poster of that image as a declaration about his intentions toward the future. This was the moment of going public, of offering an image owned by the imager which he was prepared to put out to others as a contribution to creating new cultural futures for Edmonton. Once discerned, each person's compelling image was transcribed onto a flip chart page and postered on the walls of the plenary room for all others to read. Postering compelling images was the final activity of the first day of the envisioning workshop. Participants who were not quite ready to poster or who, on reflection during the evening and following morning, decided to change their posters to incorporate new insights, were able to do so the following morning before the full group reconvened.

With the postering of eighty compelling images, everyone had their first glimpse of the substance that the project might produce. We kept no record of these initial individual images of the future of culture in Edmonton; they were not transcribed and distributed, but kept by their authors as the building blocks for the next day's work of scenario building in teams. I have no recollection of my response to the images, except to have been overwhelmed at having to digest so many.

Forming Scenario Teams

My recollection is that all but five of the first-day participants returned for the second day of the envisioning workshop.[16] Once all the compelling images which were going to be offered had been postered, participants were invited to read all of the posters with a view to identifying those images which were in some significant way connected to their own images of the future. The purpose of doing so was for "participants to form themselves into like-minded [policy] teams to construct a detailed scenario of Edmonton's cultural future: its life, activities, and expression" (Ziegler, 1988, p. 19). A policy team was defined as consisting of no more than a dozen participants who share a common focus or a common vision for Edmonton's cultural future. Participants were invited to form provisional teams guided by the questions, "Why should 'we' work together? What is our (potential) common vision of Edmonton's cultural future as evidenced by central themes or compelling images?" (Ziegler, 1988, p. 20). As a means of making the large amount of information more manageable, Ziegler labelled different wall sections of the plenary room according to themes he had identified by reading the posters at the end of the previous afternoon. Beyond this, no guidance was provided to participants on who might work together; rather, they were enjoined to form teams solely on the basis of congruent elements of their compelling images. This process took most of the morning as participants read and endeavoured to retain up to eighty images; put questions to the authors of images which seemed to have something in common with their own; milled about, provisionally clustering and reclustering, amalgamating and dividing in a quest to discern together a potential scenario team in which they might work while maintaining fidelity to their own compelling images.

Eventually eleven groupings precipitated out from the milling and announced their areas of focus to one another. Teams had provisionally formed around shared concerns of culture and education, democratizing culture, culture and media, arts as a vehicle for social change, culture and public spaces, role of government in culture, culture and wellness, neighbourhoods and culture, cultural centres, and multiculturalism. The remainder of the day was spent in building detailed scenarios of the future using the envisioning practices learned the day before. Participants were exhorted to maintain fidelity to their individual compelling images while building elements they held in common to create a new vision which would go beyond congruences to a new state of affairs shared by all. This imaginative work was to be done in the future-present moment; that is, using the present tense as if the future has happened and is current reality.

Guidance was given to help teams develop goal statements, central themes, indicators, positive and negative consequences, assumptions, rationales, and values for their visions and to cross-reference the impact of each team's vision on the domains of other teams. Ziegler and the participant-facilitators visited the various teams, responding to questions about their work processes. What I remember of that four or five hour period was the great eruptions of laughter as teams lived their imagined futures together and discovered joy and delight there. Since then, I have come to consider bursts of laughter as one of the indicators that a team is succeeding in imaging a touchable, tastable, livable future.

Living their future together in their imaginations was the essence of the task; recording the future as they imaged it was also necessary. This record keeping was done on flip chart pages. As the afternoon progressed, each team was surrounded by a dozen or so pages of documentation of their envisioned future. At the end of the afternoon, the documentation was collected, transcribed by project staff, and distributed to all participants. Each team gave itself a name that it felt captured the essence of its vision. My favourite was VIRVE: Vital, Inspirational River Valley Environments. And as a final activity, the teams enacted their visions of the future for one another. Invited to do anything *but* report, teams used music, poetry, mime, charades, dramatic skits--and other participants--to show us what the future could and would be like if their intentions were realized. For the first time, I saw the incredible power of envisioning to generate alternative stories of the future which were good, true, just, compassionate, and creative. The animated portrayals of group scenarios was for me, and for Terry MacDougall, a highlight of the project. Afterward we entered nine months of tough slogging.

Action Planning

Some of the envisioners from the March workshop met to critique the scenarios, that is, to put to the authors of each scenario some difficult questions about consequences, particularly negative consequences, of their future's being realized. Commonalities and conflicts among the scenarios were identified. This was the equivalent for teams of sharing and clarifying images as individuals. The questions and observations were then fed back to each team in the form of written memos. A secondary purpose was to provide yet another opportunity for self-selected persons to become very familiar with the output of all teams, to practise and develop greater competence with the envisioning disciplines, and to form themselves into a smaller community of learners who would take some further responsibility for leadership in the project. Each team was represented among this work group, as was the advisory board and the cultural policy committee of the board.

With each team in possession of a written copy of its scenario materials and a memo posing questions to be addressed in the subsequent work of the team, all eighty participants were invited to take part in another two-day workshop in April and begin the process of connecting the teams' visions of the future back to the present. About two-thirds of the participants returned for this objectives workshop, including some representatives from all eleven teams.

Using imaging and story telling, individual team members were invited to remember the story of how their future came about by standing in that future time and telling its history since 1988. These individual futures-histories were then shared with other team members and a team futures-history constructed, beginning with events remembered in common. Again, participants were encouraged to engage their imaginations and to leave aside, for the initial work, issues of practicality, plausibility, and politics. From among the remembered events, team members were invited to identify pivotal points at which action might be taken to bring about their future, and to discover the objectives to be achieved at those moments. Each team's material now included a scenario plus short-term action objectives to realize its future vision. This work was shared with the public through a series of open houses during the month of June.

In preparation for consulting with the wider community on the provisional work produced to date, the teams were challenged to tell their stories in a way that could be understood by people who were not part of the project. Each team was provided with a standardized leaflet format which Ziegler and I had developed for the purpose. The scenario and objectives of each team were printed as submitted and copied for distribution at the open houses. One participant, an artist, was contracted to illustrate the leaflets with graphical representations of each scenario. She did this using a standardized vocabulary of pictographic images which had overtones of cave art. These pictographs were adopted by the teams and subsequently used to create name tags, etc. However, my own assessment is that they did not communicate very well or fully the visions of the teams to nonparticipants. Neither, unfortunately, did the written material prepared by the teams themselves. It took a dedicated visitor to wade through all of the displays and text to grasp the vision and objectives being offered and then to respond to the vision with comments and questions. Our lack of clarity in communicating was, I think, reflective of the immensity of what we had undertaken, our incomplete comprehension of the full process, the stage we had reached, and the nascent nature of visions we were offering, perhaps prematurely.

First Community Consultation

Although neither the written nor graphical modes of communication did justice to the scenarios, many good outcomes came from the series of twelve open houses. At the first open house, an assistant to the project director set up an area where children were invited to draw their ideas of the future. These representations added an element of playfulness and simplicity to the more self-conscious and laboured work of the adults, and they were incorporated into subsequent displays. More than 600 people attended the open houses. Some filled out questionnaires, providing comment upon, questions of, and responses to the scenarios and objectives. All written input was transcribed and made available to the team whose material was being commented on, as well as to all other teams. Some of the input was shockingly intolerant and prejudiced; it served to remind all of us, if we needed reminding, of the culture we were seeking to change. Much of the input showed teams where they needed to clarify their ideas or the language with which they sought to express their ideas. Team members took part in the open houses, engaging with visitors about the visions they were offering to the community. Deep listening and deep questioning were practised, and sometimes joint imaging as well.

One of the best outcomes of the open houses was the interest expressed by sixteen persons in joining the project. To facilitate this, workshops introducing newcomers to the futures-invention practices were set up and conducted by me and several project participants. When the newcomers had discerned their compelling images, we provided descriptions of the scenarios which had been developed to date and invited newcomers to identify themselves with an existing team or to form new ones. Eleven people joined the project. Most joined existing teams; one new team came into being with a focus on civic literacy.

Taking Action in the Present

In September, the scenario teams convened for a third two-day workshop in which they developed the short-term plans that would translate their ideas for the future into present actions. Ten teams completed this step, developing from one to four operational goals each, for a total of twenty-one goals. A second consultation was planned, in which members of the wider community would be asked to indicate their degree of support for the visions and goals. Feeling we had not been successful in communicating the vision and objectives during the earlier series of open houses, we turned this time to a professional writer to prepare an overview booklet and response questionnaire. Armed with these materials and a script and slide presentation based on them several participants made presentations to eleven audiences over a six-week period during October and November. We also advertised the availability of the booklet and mailed copies to those who requested them. Questionnaire respondents were invited to indicate the degree of support for ten visions and their associated goals on a four-point scale.

This effort at communicating the substance of the visions was also less than satisfactory. Again, the material produced did not do justice to the work of the teams. This time, the deficit was a result of the professional communicator's simplifying the material to the point where it could be understood by a general audience, but losing some of the essence of it in the process. For example, the multilayered and robust vision of the river valley was reduced to the following statement on basis of which readers were asked to rate the vision: "The river valley as a celebratory theme and symbol" (21st Century, Appendix F). However, the presence of project participants as spokespersons was an ameliorating factor, and the quantitative information was useful as one input into the priorizing of goals to put before city council. Both of these strategies--marshalling a cadre of project spokespeople and sending them out with a prepared script, and asking members of the public to rate the visions and operational goals--speak to me in retrospect of a mounting pressure to hone the output of the project to make it acceptable to its ultimately political audience. The subsequent step of the envisioning process was to accomplish the same thing in a fashion which had fidelity to the spirit of the project, despite its technical sounding name.

Priority Trade-Off Matrix

Interestingly enough, the priority trade-off matrix was not documented in the report of the Cultural Futures Project, although it was a pivotal point in determining, from within the frame of reference of the project, those operational goals which would be put forward as priorities for consideration by city council. In a one-day workshop, some members of each team considered their team's goals in relation to the goals of all other teams. Participants were asked to discern, for each of their team's goals, whether the enacting of each other goal would make it more or less likely that their goal would be achieved, and vice versa. In other words, participants were invited to render judgments on the power of the various goals to help all other goals to come about. The mathematics and record keeping of cross-referencing twenty-one goals were daunting, but by using a wall-sized chart, we were able to recognize the ten goals which seemed to be the most powerful, that is, the most likely to bring all the other goals to fruition. This approach, in which participants used the envisioning disciplines to render judgements on their own and others' work, yielded a constellation of interconnected goals which they judged, if enacted, would have the potential to move the work of all teams forward. The ten goals which emerged from this process were the ten which received the most favourable ratings from the public also. They were:

1. An integrated system of LOCAL CULTURAL CENTRES, LINKED to one another and to cultural facilities across the city, will provide opportunities for people at the local level to become involved in the broad cultural life of the community.
2. Living in and being part of a NURTURING NEIGHBOURHOOD where the residents participate in identifying their needs and deciding how those need will be met, will contribute to the health and well-being of both the individuals and the community.

3. A COMPUTER NETWORK SYSTEM LINKING ALL CITIZENS to an information centre, and to each other where desired, increased opportunities for Edmontonians to participate in all of the public activities which influence their lives.

4. A FOUNDATION FOR CULTURAL ANIMATION will encourage citizens to explore the existence and value of their own creativity and its relationship to arts and artistry, through participating in recreational arts.

5. An INTERACTIVE CULTURAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM for Edmonton will organize and deliver learning opportunities city-wide, providing life-long learning and cultural awareness for all citizens.

6. The cultural development of Edmonton will be enhanced when being a volunteer is considered a "career", with benefits included. . . . The civic government, through a community agency, will implement, support and administer a BENEFIT CREDIT SYSTEM FOR VOLUNTEERS.

7. A MULTICULTURAL UNIT IN PARKS AND RECREATION providing support for ethnically-defined community groups, will enable those groups to participate more fully in Edmonton's cultural development.

8. A CULTURAL CONGRESS, held annually in each ward and city wide, will be a forum for discussion of cultural issues by all groups and citizens. It will be a

concrete expression of participatory democracy at the municipal level.

9. ASSESSING PROGRESS IN CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT requires that research be conducted to document the present state of cultural development, and that indicators be selected to use in comparing the present state with the future state of cultural development.

10. A WORLD'S FAIR IN EDMONTON IN 2015 SHOWCASES THE RIVER VALLEY as the symbolic and physical link for Edmontonians to our environment, our social history and our cultural present. The theme of the World's Fair will be the celebration of urban family life in all cultures. . . . The World's Fair will be a celebration of all that has been accomplished to generate in Edmonton a culture worthy of worldwide attention. (21st Century, Summary, paras. 6.2. - 6.11)

Report Preparation

Preparation of a report documenting these ten initiatives in depth was the task remaining prior to delivering the creative work of the citizens to the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. It seemed obvious to all involved that I must now try my hand at communicating both the essence and the detail of nine months of intensive effort by the project participants. With mounds of printed materials at hand and memories fresh in my mind of the birth and growth of each scenario and its goals, I set about drafting the report's main chapter. In a memo of conveyance accompanying the draft, I noted that its preparation involved "thirty-five hours of writing completed between Monday morning at 8.00 a.m., and Thursday at midnight!" I remember sitting at the kitchen table, writing longhand (with my Guatemalan worry dolls to which I consigned every distracting thought), immersing myself in each scenario in turn, absorbing the detail and the essence of the scenario, referencing it to other scenarios and to the original concerns for cultural development, and venturing to structure an account of the initiative using the words of the team. I discovered through this incredibly intensive session that I was able to render other people's images in understandable prose without distorting or coopting them. This was confirmed for me by members of various teams who responded to the draft with comments like, "I understand my scenario better after reading what you have written." Since then, I have documented others' scenarios on several occasions, although always with trepidation, and only by using the words of the envisioners, which seem to have a unique power and immediacy to convey their particular vision.

The specific recommendations accompanying each initiative were formulated out of the action steps developed by each team by looking for the action that the team was calling upon city council, the civic administration, or the advisory board, to take. In addition to pulling out recommendations pertaining to the ten initiatives, Ziegler and I deduced six principles from an examination of all the visions of the project. These principles addressed matters of participation, equity, respect, plurality and diversity in cultural expression, devolution in decision making, and assessing progress (21st Century, paras. 5.3 - 5.8). These components--the ten interconnected initiatives, the specific recommendations for enacting the initiatives, and the principles--were conveyed to advisory board members in early November.

In a specially convened meeting (on Grey Cup weekend), the advisory board wrestled with the immense body of work flowing out of the efforts of more than one hundred citizens to articulate their visions for the Edmonton in which they wanted to live and develop culturally. At this moment, the aspirations of the citizens and the political realities of the advisory board met head on. To their credit, advisory board members honoured the work of the citizens by putting it forward in its entirety. They did, however, introduce a second track in which the advisory board developed its concerns for the immediate future into a set of parallel recommendations, supplemented eventually with a parallel report.

Future and Present in Tension

The tension between future and present was the major surprise for me when I reread the report a full decade after writing it. It prompts me to ask whether envisioning, with its emphasis on creating new possibilities for the long term, was an appropriate approach in this setting, given that there turned out to be very real, immediate concerns which could not go unaddressed. In the letter of transmittal, Terry MacDougall wrote, "The future focus of the Project, deliberately chosen, has not blinded the Advisory Board to the urgent needs of the present." The summary ends with the statement that "the survival and flourishing of existing organizations need to be ensured, as these are the avenues through which Edmontonians will work today to realize their visions for our cultural future" (21st Century, para. 10.0). In envisioning, there is a deliberate playing off of present and future. Envisioners use present concerns as a jumping off point to imagine a future in which those concerns are well addressed and then use the images of the future as a place to stand in order to remember the actions which helped to bring them about. We envision the future in order to take action in the present. In envisioning, this tension between the future and the present is resolved as participants discover the short-term actions which embody or enact their imagined futures.

However, in the report of the Cultural Futures Project, the tension was not resolved. Instead, the advisory board commissioned research into the state of cultural development in 1988, included it in the report as "Section X: Building on Our Strengths," and formulated from its findings two additional recommendations which differ in kind from the concrete and specific initiatives offered by the citizens. The advisory board recommended that:

> Council support existing and emerging cultural organizations and institutions dedicated to enhancing the quantity of cultural opportunities and the quality of cultural activities in the city by:
>
> a) acknowledging that cultural support is not a matter of mere subsidy and aid, but rather an opportunity for and obligation of a caring community;
>
> b) increasing the financial support to be made available to valuable cultural institutions . . . ;
>
> and by
>
> c) directing the Advisory Board to immediately re-examine tax and lease subsidy criteria and policies to significantly increase the amount of cash available to support valuable cultural organizations in the city;

and that:

> The City dedicate itself to becoming one of the most vibrant and most important centres of cultural activity in Canada by the year 2010. (21st Century, para. 10.25)

In the letter of conveyance, the advisory board signalled its intention to provide further advice to city council on the issues of immediate concern to the advisory board:

> To ensure the survival and flourishing of these existing institutions in the arts, multiculturalism and recreation, the Advisory Board is preparing proposed policy solutions to current issues presently facing Council, the Advisory Board and the communities. These recommendations, concerned with funding principles, support and allocations to existing and emerging not-for-profit groups, will be forwarded to Council in January 1989. (21st Century)

Subsequent correspondence, council minutes, and council reports indicate that this is exactly what happened. As the Cultural Futures Project recommendations were making their nine-month journey through the city administration on their way to being considered by council, so was a report from the advisory board entitled "Recommended Policy Solutions on Current Issues." Both reports were eventually considered by council on September 26, 1989, and both were referred back to the administration for review; in the case of the second report, back to the advisory board as well.

What are we to make of this double-tracking of policy proposals? Are we to conclude that the visions and recommendations of project participants failed adequately to address the cultural development concerns of the present? Project chair Terry MacDougall responded with an emphatic "No!" He felt that, in order to unlock the future possibilities of the Cultural Futures Project, the historical issues pressing upon the present needed to be dealt with. The advisory board, reading the evolving political climate as well as the emerging project materials, decided it had a responsibility to address what it saw as a threat to the Project's reception and so added its recommended solutions. The text of the report acknowledges that "certain of the Board's recommendations flow directly from the Cultural Futures Project . . . . Other recommendations have originated from within the Board itself" (21st Century, "Letter of Conveyance"). Fortunately, while the recommendations were arrived at through two quite different processes, they did not contradict or cancel one another. The work of the citizens was respected and supplemented by an advisory board concerned with short-term solutions to historic and intransigent problems.

What about the adequacy of the citizens' recommendations to realize their visions and thereby to address their concerns of the present? I have had the feeling, confirmed now in my rereading of the Cultural Futures materials, that we faltered somehow in our translation of the visions into short-term actions. It was as if the creative tension in which the future and the present are both held gave way, and the creative resources brought to bear on the future scenarios were not there in the same way for connecting those scenarios back to the present and imaging the actions which would realize those futures, as provided for in the later steps of the envisioning process. That the short-term actions failed somehow to fully capture the power of the individual and group scenarios of the future may be what Terry was expressing when he has commented more than once that the best work of the project was the individual images and team scenarios produced on the first two days of envisioning.

I can think of several factors which may have contributed to this. One is the emphasis which we as organizers, sponsors and facilitators put on "inventing" the future and leaving aside, initially, the constraints of the present. There were good reasons for this. We were aware of the policy exhaustion of the community; we wanted people to appreciate that this process was new and had something different to offer; we wanted participants to be free to do their best work and therefore felt the need to hold the "present" at bay during the early stages of the envisioning work.

A second factor which may have led teams to formulate action steps which failed to fully realize their visions was the inherent challenge of maintaining new modes of working as one approaches the present, with all of its constraints. For example, a wonderful vision of a just and respectful multicultural society in which difference is celebrated was to be operationalized by adding a multicultural staff unit to the Parks and Recreation Department. This rather mundane and bureaucratic proposal has the futile feel of using present-day methods to create a future different from today, rather than the imaginative unfolding of the future in the present as invited by envisioning.

Certain external considerations may comprise a third set of factors contributing to short term actions which failed to embody the power of the future scenarios. The project extended over a period of one full year, giving long periods of time between work sessions. While the imaginative and spiritual work of envisioning benefits from intervals for reflection, five months between the objectives workshop and the action planning workshop was perhaps too long, and some momentum and enthusiasm were lost. Also, as the project proceeded, pressures in the external environment began to impinge. A very negative newspaper article at the time of the initial envisioning workshop challenged the premises and utility of the project (Geiger, 1988, p. B1). A few months later, participants had the experience of being less than successful in communicating their visions and objectives during the June open houses. Then they saw their work packaged by a professional writer and put out for public response in a form which hardly did justice to their eight months of intensive personal investment. In our desire to consult with the wider community, we may have put the still-fragile work of the teams out for comment prematurely, and on both occasions of outreach and consultation we failed to find modes of communication which worked for the nature of the material we were attempting to share. Even within the friendly and supportive environment of the project, one team found themselves working on a future scenario which was beyond the capacity of other envisioners to appreciate and respond to.[17]

So perhaps it is not surprising that many teams defaulted to quite traditional action steps and recommendations and defaulted to conceiving of these initial steps as being taken by existing civic entities. I have already mentioned the recommendation for adding multiculturalism staff to the recreation department. Another example is from the civic literacy team, which envisioned "a computer network system linking all citizens to an information centre, and to each other where desired," as a way of "increas[ing] opportunities for Edmontonians to participate in all of the public activities which influence their lives" (21st Century, para. 6.4.1). As a first step in initiating the network, they recommended the creation of an interactive display of futures projects to be housed in City Hall or the public library. This action was perhaps too oblique to serve as a first step in realizing the vision. Subsequently, the creation of Freenets in Edmonton and other places has operationalized some of the informational elements of the vision for civic literacy.

While these examples are of action steps that might be called too timid, others were perhaps too bold; that is, too far for the reach of the present. One example of this might be the proposal for an interactive cultural communications system for Edmonton. It was conceived of as a municipal version of the provincial educational broadcasters, but interactive, anticipating the melding of broadcast and internet transmission only now in its trial stages in Edmonton and elsewhere.[18] However, while some of the initiatives might be considered too timid, and some too bold, some were just right in the view of city council, and they were acted upon--after a fashion.

Council Action

The report of the Cultural Futures Project was presented to the executive committee of city council on December 7, 1988, spoken to by the project chair, another member of the advisory board, a participant and me. Its presentation and reception were indistinguishable from the thousands of other reports council and its committees receive each year. And the executive committee's motion to refer the report to another committee of council was the standard disposition of many reports.

Nine months later, the report appeared on the agenda of the utilities and finance committee of council, together with the advisory board report entitled "Recommended Policy Solutions to Current Issues." The two reports were heard and debated separately and both were again referred, this time to the civic administration and, in the case of the current issues report, to the advisory board as well. At this meeting, councillors heard some statements of strong support for the recommendations and attestations to the meaning and significance of the project for participants. Councillors also heard some statements in opposition to the recommendations of the report, particularly from spokespersons for the umbrella organization of community leagues. The position of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues was that the leagues already fulfilled the functions called for in the Nurturing Neighbourhoods and the Local Cultural Centres, Linked initiatives. The irony of this claim was that members of the community leagues, and even of the federation executive, were among the members of the teams which proposed those initiatives in response to what were, for them, needs unmet in the present. Some speakers endorsed all of the initiatives and recommendations; all speakers supported the final two recommendations (those supplied by the advisory board), and most endorsed the first two recommendations (definition and principles) as well.

Motions were put to adopt three of these four recommendations with modifications, and refer the remainder to Edmonton Parks and Recreation to prepare a report on implementation of the recommendations within existing resources. The modifications were to include sport within the proposed definition of culture and to add to the principles to guide cultural development, professionalism and excellence and financial viability (U. Watkiss, "Memo"; September 29, 1989). These two additional principles were never defined. The advisory board's recommendation concerning current funding issues was referred to Parks and Recreation and the advisory board for clarification of funding. The advisory board's independent report on current issues, which made more specific suggestions for expanding funding to arts, recreation, and multicultural groups was also referred to the department and to the advisory board for clarification on financing. All of these actions were recommended to council and endorsed by council at the next meeting, on September 26, 1989. I will not comment further on the separate advisory board report on current issues, except to say that the matters it was attempting to resolve did finally achieve resolution nearly a decade later, when efforts by the Edmonton Arts Council led to revised policies governing city grants to arts organizations and tax and lease subsidy and led to an additional $75,000 being added to the city budget for grants to arts and festival organizations.

Administrative Review

For the recommendations of the Cultural Futures Project, the adventure continued. Under the leadership of a civic employee who had been a participant in the Cultural Futures Project, the Parks and Recreation Department instigated a corporation-wide review of the ten priority initiatives. I was not a part of this process beyond serving initially as a resource to the review group in satisfying themselves that they had a full understanding of the initiatives and the scenarios from which they had emerged. I urged that the citizens who originated the scenarios serve as resources for this, but my suggestion was not taken up. Not only was I not a part of the review, although I had returned to my position in the department, I did not even read the interim materials that were produced. So it was with real pleasure and relief that I discovered, ten years later, the honour and respect with which the work of the citizens was considered.

The corporation-wide impact analysis proceeded by means of three activities (Edmonton, 1989a, p. 2). The first step was to restate the ten major initiatives, with the restatements to be used as background material by city staff and external people who participated in the review. The second step was a series of workshops in which staff from city departments and agencies reviewed the initiatives to "find ways, whenever possible, to implement the proposals [by] incorporating them into existing plans, processes and resources in order to minimize costs" (p. 3):

> These workshops generated information from a corporate perspective on: (i) the potential impacts . . . on the City's philosophy, policies, processes, organizational structure as well as the financial impact, and (ii) an outline of possible plans of action for implementing the Initiative, describing who will be responsible for each step, and how much it will cost. (p. 3)

The third activity in producing the impact analysis was to interview representatives from several external agencies named in the recommendations of the Cultural Futures Project and to "determine if it was appropriate for them to have an ongoing role in analyzing and implementing the Initiatives" (p. 4). A fourth step is referred to elsewhere: the ten initiatives (as modified) were ranked according to corporate criteria" (Edmonton, 1989b, p. 1).

And so the civic administration took up the challenge on which we had faltered; namely, to attempt to translate into action plans the essence of the initiatives. However, now the focus of implementation was exclusively on the civic corporation, and this had the effect of distorting the original intent of some initiatives. For example, the

Nurturing Neighbourhood initiative had envisioned a paid staff person to assist the community members in identifying their needs and clarifying how they saw those needs being met. This person was to be engaged by the neighbourhood and not by the city, although the funds to pay for the position might have come from the city. In the impact analysis, in general, the recommended actions emerging from the corporate review were even more bureaucratic than those emerging from the work of the citizens. For example, in conceiving an action plan for the Local Cultural Centre, Linked the impact analysis group saw the creation of an interagency committee composed of affected city departments and key external agencies providing similar services.

Some of the initiatives, however, resonated with other currents circulating within the city at the time, especially Nurturing Neighbourhoods with community policing (just being introduced to Edmonton by the deputy chief who participated in the review) and with an administration task force on corporate integrated service delivery. The Multiculturalism Unit in the Parks and Recreation Department resonated with giving corporate attention to employment equity, although the original proposal was radically modified to refer to services to "all visible minorities." The idea of a cultural congress resonated with an increasing recognition of the need to make space for the claims and contributions of multicultural groups within the entire spectrum of recreation and culture. Some of the elements in the world's fair initiative dovetailed with the priority being given to development of a river valley master plan, although other aspects of the initiative appeared to conflict with department priorities for preservation rather than development. The corporation wide review was very comprehensive, and articulated action plans which, if undertaken, would have stipulated direction and activity on multiple fronts for many years.

My feeling, reading the Impact Analysis now, is that rather than concluding (as I had) that the power of the project's vision had been dissipated in the extensive corporate review, it would be as valid to say that the ideas were working their way into the minds and hearts of thirty-three civic staff from fourteen city departments and agencies. One of the ten initiatives was given a good try (more about that later) and another four received the blessing of council although the follow-through is hard to establish, in part because history has overtaken them and perhaps in part because I left the employ of the city not long after the corporate impact report was tabled with council. The administration's report attempted to have the remaining lower-priority plans referred to the identified lead department for consideration in future forecast periods, without success. Hence some of the administration's considerable work was also denied formal endorsement although, as with the work of the original citizen participants, the ideas no doubt made their way into subsequent decisions and actions.

Nurturing Neighbourhoods

The one outcome of the Cultural Futures Project which can be clearly traced from the original envisioning workshop through to a pilot project approved and funded by city council was the Nurturing Neighbourhoods initiative. The vision was of a neighbourhood where:

> neighbours care for each other, and share their knowledge and talents. Citizens meet regularly to identify and debate neighbourhood issues, particularly civic, health, social, cultural and educational. Through dialogue and collaboration, residents and professional staff work in partnership to ensure optimum use of resources to provide needed services. (Edmonton, 1993, p. 1)

The team's recommendation for operationalizing this vision was that:

> Council endorse the concept of nurturing neighbourhoods; approve a pilot project for a nurturing neighbourhood; allocate funding in the first year in the amount of $40,000; and direct senior staff of City Departments (including social Services, Parks and Recreation, Planning, Police, etc.) to plan and

> implement joint strategies which support the development of nurturing neighbourhoods. (21st Century, para. 6.3.14)

The recommendation emerging from the corporate review, where Nurturing Neighbourhoods was given top priority of all the Cultural Futures Project initiatives, provided for:

> an Inter-Agency Task Force to assess feasibility, find opportunities for decentralized, integrative, participatory service delivery and determine community needs for increased participation and more integrated services. (Edmonton, 1989b, p. 2)

This recommendation was endorsed by council on February 28, 1991, when terms of reference for a pilot project were requested. These were developed by an interdepartmental committee in 1992. In 1993 council mandated the involvement of citizen representatives on a steering committee to review and refine the terms of reference. In May of 1993, council unanimously approved the terms of reference for a Nurturing Neighbourhood pilot project--a full five years from the occasion of its being envisioned.

The terms of reference, despite the fact the pilot project was now wholly a city initiative, embodied many of the elements of the original vision. Particularly noteworthy was the civic proponents' awareness that a nurturing neighbourhood meant their finding new approaches to delivering city services. They recognized, for example, this would mean city and agency staff "being flexible and responsive to community needs, cooperating with each other and with other department in providing services, and supporting local involvement in initiatives aimed at solving community problems" (Edmonton, 1993, pp. 2-3). Some essential aspects of the original vision, such as coterminous boundaries for all city services, did not appear in the conception of the pilot project. However, in feel and philosophy, the approach had fidelity to the original vision. There was even an intention, substantially realized, to have the pilot community self-select. This one detail, and the manner in which it was accomplished among the four communities interested in piloting the concept, spoke to me of the full grasp the lead staff person had of the spirit and intent of a nurturing neighbourhood.

Conclusions

As I reread and relive the Cultural Futures Project with the benefit of a decade of time and additional experience, I am struck by the absence of collaborative action by citizens and the city on the visions offered through the project. Where action was taken, it was either by the city to the exclusion of the participants, as in the Nurturing Neighbourhoods pilot project, or by the participants without support and assistance from the city. Two exceptions are initiatives related to the cultural congress and the world's fair. Some members of the river valley team created a Capital City Events Foundation to work toward bidding on a world's fair, as per their scenario. However, their inaugural event, the world premiere of The Dinosaur Show, met with political, financial, and box office failure, thus dashing their aspirations for a world's fair bid. The positive legacy was a permanently-serviced festival site, which is only now seeing substantial use as a "vital, inspirational river valley environment." The advisory board did hold a first cultural congress to discuss cultural issues. However, when additional support was not forthcoming from the city, the plans for an annual congress were suspended.

Perhaps the lack of collaborative action on initiatives was connected with the struggle the civic corporation had in coming to grips with the output of the project. That which we offered to the city was not in a form and of a substance to which it could respond readily. Certainly nothing that could be considered a comprehensive cultural policy resulted from the project. The principles which were adopted comprised an element of a cultural policy, but even they were not in a form to be useful as a touchstone for cultural development. I know; I continued to call people's attention to them throughout the years I remained with the department, but the principles didn't take on an existence in the collective minds of staff let alone elected officials.

The policy vacuum we sought to fill--the vision which we felt had been missing from other policy attempts over the preceding decade--remained at the end of our year of major investment by significant numbers of people. The short-term issues also remained. In frustration and exasperation, the arts community concluded that change would only come if the structure itself were changed. All of their subsequent efforts were honed toward the creation of an arts council for Edmonton. When this happened six years later, any linking of the various elements of a cultural community was severed in favour of separate communities advocating on behalf of arts, sports, recreation and multiculturalism. The arts eclipsed the others in establishing its own governance structure and working through it to increase funding, public support, joint endeavours with the business community, and increasingly sophisticated advocacy.

In the meantime, I had opportunity once again to propose envisioning as a public policy approach, this time in the city of Kitchener at a time when that community was seeking to develop a cultural strategic plan. The contrasts between the Kitchener project and the Edmonton one help to point up the strengths and limitations of envisioning as an approach to public policy.

Chapter 6

Kitchener CulturePlan

In this second case study, I will provide some background to the CulturePlan project, describe the shape and design of the project, and then focus my analysis on four or five pivotal moments when the project--or I as facilitator--was significantly reshaped.

CulturePlan was a project by means of which the City of Kitchener sought to develop and adopt a cultural strategic plan for the city. It spanned approximately twelve months, from July 1995, when I was selected as the consultant, to July 1996, when the report and recommendations were laid before city council. The development of a cultural strategic plan was the final task of a temporary advisory committee on arts and culture established by city council two years earlier. Previous tasks undertaken by the temporary advisory committee included a survey of arts and culture activity and needs followed by an arts conference to identify key issues in the arts community. The terms of reference for the committee seemed to assume that analysis of these key issues would yield draft policy recommendations; no process was indicated by means of which the committee would move from one to the other, from issues to policy recommendations. The policy recommendations, once formulated, were to be reviewed with the arts and culture community before being submitted to city council as a cultural strategic plan.

Several events had occurred in Kitchener and area which contributed to the attention being given to cultural policy in the mid 1990s. A new city hall had opened in the early part of the decade, with public spaces designed to showcase and host arts events. A new staff position had been created with responsibility for arts and culture programming; the position provided a focus within the administration for arts and culture groups. The neighbouring cities of Waterloo and Cambridge had recently completed cultural plans. And Kitchener continued to support, with approximately $1 million annually, a superb performing arts facility that serves the entire region without assistance from neighbouring or regional governments. All these factors are background to the creation of a temporary advisory committee and their charge to develop cultural policy for the City of Kitchener.

Having completed its earlier tasks, the committee developed terms of reference for a CulturePlan study. These terms of reference called for a process, the nature of which was not specified, to be interposed between the identification and analysis of key issues, and development of policy proposals. Besides the inclusion of a process, the study's terms of reference spelled out the outcomes desired from the project:

A Vision Statement for a willed future for arts and

> culture in Kitchener; a Mission Statement relative to arts and culture; identification of core values that support the vision; actions steps with strategic targets prioritized to work toward the vision; and a blue print for necessary strategic alliances and community partnership that would sustain the vision. (Kitchener, 1995a, p. 2)

When a first call for proposals by the committee netted no submissions which were judged by the committee to be adequate for their purposes, one of the committee members, who had previous experience with envisioning, requested that I be sent a copy of the call for proposals. Although I was wary in the face of the language of strategic planning, I thought I saw an opening for envisioning in the language of vision and the reference to a willed future. Caught up with the possibilities for approaching the CulturePlan study via envisioning, I imaged a version of a project I would like to do, costed it, and submitted a proposal.

The selection committee was sufficiently interested in my proposal to request an interview which, at my suggestion, was held via teleconferencing. I was prepared to risk whatever handicap this might place on me, partly because I had three years of experience with distance communications and was convinced that they could serve well for many purposes, and partly because I wanted the committee to appreciate that a long-distance relationship could be workable. My note to file indicates that when I asked everyone at the end of the call what it was like for them to conduct the interview by teleconference, "all were satisfied with the phone interview." The outcome of the interview was that the selection committee was very interested in the process I was proposing but wanted to meet me face to face.

The second interview provided opportunity for me to probe the intentions of committee members, particularly with respect to their level of dissatisfaction with traditional approaches to policy development and on the matter of a completely open invitation to citizens to participate. I was satisfied on both accounts, particularly by the chair of the selection committee, who became in time the chair of the advisory committee and effectively the citizen chair of the project. In turn, his concerns were that I should spend enough time in the community to become a part of the enterprise, rather than parachuting in and disappearing again, and that I be able to do the work in the forty-five days budgeted. The assumptions underlying both of these concerns were revealed in a question drafted for use in the interviews with consultants, which read, "Please tell us how you propose to reach and involve the artists and supporters as you assess the community needs" (Kitchener, 1995b, p.1). I'm sure I responded that it would not be me who would be assessing the community's concerns, rather the participants would be assessing their own and then imagining a Kitchener in which those concerns had been well addressed.

The selection committee also wanted to know if the process I was proposing was structured or a "free-for-all that might get out of hand." I hope I responded that the process was highly structured and it could get out of hand, in the sense of leading us into places we could neither predetermine nor preclude. For it was precisely a search for newness, for breakthrough possibilities, that would lead them to choose the process I was proposing, rather than another process. In the course of the second interview, the selection committee decided they would like to have me work with them to prepare a cultural strategic plan according to the process I had proposed. The one aspect of my proposal which was modified by the committee was to have the secretarial and administrative support supplied by staff of the parks and recreation department, rather than by a subcontractor in Edmonton. I was to be very grateful for this change, both for the alleviation of workload and for the additional presence it provided for me on location.

Envisioning Culture in Kitchener

To develop a cultural strategic plan in conjunction with the arts and culture community of Kitchener, I proposed two, two-day envisioning workshops about one month apart, to take place during the fall. Participation in these workshops would be by invitation and self-selection, with the invitation to be distributed as widely as possible within the community. I anticipated that the material required as outputs--vision statement, mission, values, critical success indicators, partnerships, and action plans --would come out of the envisioning work of the citizens. This material would then be published and responses invited from the wider community through open houses and written feedback. I would then work with the study team, consisting of the advisory committee plus two councillors and a city staff person, to prioritize action plans and formulate recommendations for city council's consideration. This was the study design accepted by the selection committee.

Inviting Participation

The first step of the project was for the advisory committee to extend invitations to participate to members of the community. I proposed thirty participants in addition to the fifteen on the study team, or a total of forty-five people. I had arrived at this number by way of three considerations: budget constraints, workable numbers for workshopping, and a desire to ensure that self-selecting participants would outnumber designated participants by a generous margin. Preparing and distributing the invitations became a pivotal moment in the advisory committee's understanding of the open nature of the process I had proposed. Their decision was to send a letter to a list of 450 organizations and individual arts and culture supporters in Kitchener, a list that the Parks and Recreation Department had developed over time. My files contain an initial draft of the letter inviting the recipient "to participate in a unique event which we expect will significantly change the way we participate in arts and culture in the Waterloo region," and "to assist us [the arts and culture committee]" in "delivering a Cultural Plan for the community." At my suggestion, the letter was redrafted to emphasize collaborative development of visions and action plans, avoiding an us-and-them separation and any suggestion that changes were going to be imposed by somebody on someone else. When distributed, the letter invited the recipients to participate "in a unique process by means of which we can discover together a shared vision for arts and culture in the community."

The letter did its work. Seventy-one persons responded, with fifty-four indicating they would like to participate. The arts and culture committee felt they could not accommodate all fifty-four and looked for ways to reduce the number. I had offered the committee the following criteria which were congruent with envisioning principles: persons who know themselves to be concerned about the future of Kitchener, and of culture; who have hope that things can be different and better than they are; are knowledgeable about a particular area of cultural activity and the community as a whole; who are committed and willing to invest four days of workshop time, plus follow-through with public outreach; and who are imaginative and open to new ideas, concepts and possibilities emerging from the work of others--and from within oneself. I also suggested that the committee members resist any urge to add people who in their view ought to be involved but hadn't volunteered themselves; that they assume 10 percent would not follow through with registering, and that another 10 percent would start but not finish the four days. If the numbers were still too large, we could consider identifying some interest or disciplinary areas where there seemed to be a disproportionately high number and ask those people to decide among themselves who would participate, by lottery if necessary.

Armed with these criteria and suggestions, six members of the committee reviewed the list of 54 respondents, combining my "principles of self-selection with our need for diversity" (S. Scadron-Wattles, personal communication, September 28, 1995) and then went down the list in order of receipt. In the end, a letter of welcome was sent to all who wanted to participate, saying that "the hoped for complement of people have responded to the invitation with a commitment to participate." Included in the letter were the criteria for participation outlined above and a response form by means of which persons would formally register themselves. A fortnight prior to the first workshop, forty-four persons had done so; eventually fifty-one people arrived for the first workshop, and all were accommodated. It might seem that the two months of struggle by the advisory committee were unnecessary; however, my view is that having to wrestle with an approach predicated upon invitation and self-selection, rather than on credentials and designation, helped the members of the advisory committee to appreciate some of the underlying principles at work in envisioning.

"Who's Playing Here!"

A pivotal moment in the project occurred early on the second day of the first two-day envisioning workshop. The individual concerns and imaging work of the first day had gone quite well. I remember making mental notes of a few patterns in the dynamic of the group. One was a sense of fractiousness and competitiveness within the community--between disciplines, generations, even between recreational and professional orientations. I also noted that some people had come with ready-made solutions. Generally, though, the invitations issued by me and three local cofacilitators were accepted: to introduce oneself by telling of a time when one was an actor in history, or of an experience of the arts/culture which had a profound impact on one; to uncover and speak a concern or dissatisfaction with arts or culture in the present; and to image a future in which one's particular concern had been well addressed.

The protocols of deep listening were introduced and practised as people paired to tell their stories of the past, present, and future. Some posters of individual compelling images went up on the wall before participants left at the end of the day; the remainder were to be postered by the next morning. Looking at the posters before I left for the day I felt most people had done good work, and had uncovered and offered something important of themselves in the form of an image of the future.

When we convened the next morning, we began with a plenary praxis session, reflecting on the work of the day before. I have only one note to file from that praxis: a person who declared to the group her realization that she had "never listened in [her] life!" One moment is indelibly impressed in my memory. In expressing either a concern with his experience of the process so far, or a challenge to the process, one person said something about playing games, referring to the imaginative aspects of the envisioning work in a negative way, suggesting that it had little or no value and that it was time for us to get on with the real work of policy development. Out of my mouth, in a forceful and powerful voice, came the words, "Who's playing here?!" I went back over the invitations of the previous day, showing how at each step each person was invited to focus on that which mattered most to him, to conduct his explorations with self-honesty, to speak his discoveries to someone who was making no attempt to influence the exploration but only to assist it, and to discern that which was most worthy of himself to share with the others as a compelling image. I think I ended with a challenge to participants to decide if they had taken the invitations seriously and if their work so far represented their worthiest aspirations; and if not, I invited them to redo or remove it.

Silence ensued, and in that moment I felt the energy of the workshop shift as participants acknowledged more fully the opportunity they were being given to truly create the futures in which they wanted to dwell and to which they wanted to contribute. Looking back, I realized that this point in the process, the point of postering one's compelling image for others to view and respond to, is a high risk moment, and every group must find its own way to break through that barrier or the opportunity is lost to create something other than an extrapolation of the past and present into the future. One CulturePlan participant who was also a journalist wrote in a newspaper article:

> It was a nerve-wracking experience (at least for me) to share this vision with the entire group. (Imagine making a poster about your vision of the future and sharing it with near strangers!) After reading everyone else's posters (and not feeling nearly as silly as I was afraid I might), we created small groups of shared vision. (S. Melville, 1995, p. E10)

Only occasionally do I speak forth my truth with such power, and only in response to moments where all might be lost because we fail to see the genuineness of the invitation and the opportunity. So seldom do we experience an honest-to-goodness open opportunity that sometimes we do not know it for what it is; and if we do, sometimes we cannot bring ourselves to trust it and act into the opening. Once the failure of trust is surmounted, I have not yet seen a failure of courage or of imagination. That said, there were more project- and facilitator-transforming moments ahead in the CulturePlan adventure.

A word about the teams: Eight teams formed and spent the afternoon developing detailed scenarios of the future shared by their members, beginning with individual compelling images and collectively imaging, listening, questioning, and discerning. My impression was that most teams assembled on the basis of shared images of the future, although I sensed that two teams found their members more on the basis of, in one case, a shared concern in the present and shared social considerations in the other case. These two teams struggled with the scenario-building process but the others entered into the future-present moment and imaged together a world they would seek to create. Scenarios were developed dealing with cultural facilities, downtown infrastructure and festivals, arts education, arts information, and other focuses which were not yet named by their authors. At the end of the afternoon we pulled our chairs into a large circle, and the teams took turns enacting their futures for us. There was much delight, laughter of recognition, acknowledgement of good stories being shared about the future and, I think, admiration and respect for each other and the hopeful, life-affirming work they had done together. This was a very different place from which we had started thirty-six hours earlier.

Building Community

The community building continued with the second two-day envisioning workshop, in which the eight teams sought to link their scenarios of the future with the present and find paths connecting the two so that these paths might be travelled from 1995 forward. The first activity involved each team's revisiting its scenario and reconnecting with it after an interval of three weeks, revising as they wished. Then each team was invited to visit each other team, read the details of their scenarios and look for elements of shared vision. In each of two subsequent activities, as each team told its futures-history and identified pivotal opportunities for taking action, they were encouraged to view one another's work and to incorporate anything from another team which fit their team's story. My recollection is that these invitations to cross pollination were not fruitful; the teams had come to own their own visions, saw no conflict--and lots of congruence--with other visions, and were content to continue with the practical work of translating the future visions into present action. Along the way, a member of the team which turned out to offer some of the most creative and innovative work to the project had a moment of insight when he realized and expressed the thought that his team had failed to grasp the notion of conceiving a future unconstrained by the present; the team redid its work, catching up with the others as the day progressed. Hearing some common opportunity sightings, I thought that participants might choose to reconfigure themselves around these, rather than by scenarios. That didn't happen; again, teams seemed quite strongly committed to their own work and not particularly receptive to new groupings.

By the afternoon of the second day, teams had developed between one and six operational goals each and presented these to one another in plenary. Operational goals, for which we later used the label "initiatives," were translations of opportunity sightings into short-term action. Twenty-two different initiatives were described in some detail to the plenary, with questions invited for clarification. Some teams had duplicate goals, and on hearing these, one team or another would drop the goal which they felt was of lesser importance to them and capably covered by the goal of another team. I recall an atmosphere of respect and appreciation for one another's work. These goals or initiatives can be directly traced through the remaining phases of the project and constitute the substance of the recommendations to city council.

Two moments occurred during this second workshop which stand out in my memory as pivotal to the project and especially to the strengthening of community, the outlines of which had begun to appear at the end of the previous workshop. At one point in the second workshop, we were at a collective loss as to how to proceed. The tentative activity outline I had prepared seemed not to be helping the teams, or perhaps as a facilitator my assumptions about what should happen next were getting in the way. In a plenary praxis session, with all forty-five chairs set in a circle in the middle of the big room, we struggled to understand where we were and where we were going. I was unable to give any direction and perhaps, as I suggested above, the direction I had offered had been unhelpful. However, as we made our offerings to one another and practised the protocols of listening and questioning, a way emerged which was recognized by many or all as a way to go. I have no recollection of how we came to be in a spin, or what proposed path restored us to our purpose, but I do remember that I was powerless to solve the problem.

In a telephone conversation a few weeks later, the same journalist who had written about her trepidation at postering her vision before strangers, observed that it was necessary for me to be lost along with the others. Otherwise, she commented, if I had helped us out of our morass from a stance outside the group, it would have delayed yet again the occasion when the group found its own way collectively. I agree with her assessment and recognize that resolving our struggle collectively helped to shift the group away from the last vestiges of facilitator dependence into interdependence. These occasions cannot be engineered, of course, but I welcome them when they happen and remind myself that I don't need to expect myself to be equal to every challenge, although often the person paying me as a consultant expects me to be. This goes to the heart of the principle that each person is her own expert on her own future--and on the process of bringing that future into the here and now, solving process problems in ways that have fidelity to her vision as she does so. The future is not, after all, out there in time and space, but in here as an alternative way of being in the present.

Celebrating Community

A second moment of high vulnerability and high affirmation occurred at the end of the second day of the second workshop. A city councillor had asked to be able to distribute tokens of thanks on behalf of the city for a collective investment of citizen time estimated by one participant to have a value of more than $40,000. Not wanting our concluding celebration to be recast as a civic recognition ceremony, I suggested that each participant come forward one at a time and receive the spoken appreciation of his co-envisioners on his way to receiving a city pin from the councillor. No sooner was the suggestion out of my mouth than I realized the risks I had opened us to! What if someone came forward and nobody spoke any appreciation? What if I, the facilitator, couldn't couldn't come up with some appreciation if all others were silent?

The reward, however, would be confirmation of community, and celebration of what we now meant to one another after four days of major emotional and psychic investment in a shared endeavour. There were a few moments when it seemed as if no one had an appreciation to speak, but someone always did, and the tributes were particular, apt, and insightful. We ended by speaking our appreciation to the two councillors present who, although they had not worked along with us, had maintained their interest in our progress and their faith that our approach was one which would yield a cultural strategic plan.

Teams were left with responsibility for completing their work to their satisfaction, and sending a final draft in hard copy or on disk to the project office within three weeks. (This was in contrast with the Edmonton project, where staff collected and transcribed the work of the teams.) Eventually material came in from all eight teams. This is the material from which I drafted a seventy-five page comprehensive report.

From Envisioning to Draft Policy

When the report was ready, it was distributed to all participants with an invitation to attend an evening meeting in early March to consider how the report might be used to consult a wider public. I thought I had done a rather good job, at least a thorough one, of teasing out from the teams' work the various elements needed for a draft cultural plan and of presenting the scenarios and action plans of each team. I had written a section on shared vision, derived from my perception of what all scenarios had in common; identified core values embedded in the work of all teams; logged the community partnerships and strategic alliances envisioned by all teams; and proposed a city mission statement reflecting the roles and responsibilities ascribed to the city by all teams. I didn't attempt to articulate critical success indictors, but all the other elements required from the CulturePlan study were there in draft form. Finally, from the action steps specified by each team, I pulled out and framed recommendations for presentation to city council. It was a huge piece of work completed, I felt, with fidelity to the process and to the visions of the participants. Then why did the participants who attended the outreach planning meeting respond with "anger, blame and fear," as my note to file records?

I began the meeting with an invitation for people to share what they celebrated of their work together. My notes show that responses ranged from "the document is the main reason to celebrate," to statements of action people were already taking on their visions, to the continuing investment reflected by the presence of twenty people at the meeting. Several speakers spoke of daring to hope: "At first [these ideas] didn't seem possible, now [they] seem possible;" "Looks like [the ideas] could happen;" and "Some things might actually happen." I recorded other comments celebrating the congruence of our visions, the openness of the process, people being brought together, and the groundswell to make things better.

Then we got to concerns with the report. Too much information; too short a time to respond; no priority among the recommendations; too much talking about what we'd done and not enough about what's in it for others--parents, business people, etc.; three or four of the recommendations carry exceedingly heavy price tags and might destroy any receptivity to the rest of the work; too narrowly focused on Kitchener and not addressing the region; needs visuals; should emphasize the economics to maintain the reader's interest; should be somewhat artistic; and so on. Gradually as people vented their frustration that this report didn't communicate what they wanted the way they wanted, comments and suggestions began to emerge which pointed to a way forward. My notes of March 6, 1996 reveal an emerging direction:

> The document should be long on stimulus, long on response, and short on substance; outreach version should invite response and participation; requires a different context--not a report but a presentation document of three pages. . . ; present it like a book you want to read--the cover only; the vision only, not all the back up. . . ; [emulate] the federal budget coverage in the newspaper--use sidebars, give successive depth; layer it; [build in] links and jumps; [create] interest trails; everything must lead to participation/response--the point is not to get it out, but to bring people in; point to meetings; use [it] as a survey and [compile] the data; etc.

Eventually we realized that we were conceiving of three separate documents. One would be a record of the envisioning work; the seventy-five page document already in hand would serve this internal purpose adequately. The second document would be for outreach purposes; its audience would be the wider community and it would have the qualities pointed to above. The third would be a strategic plan; its audience would be city council and it would contain recommendations as to who would do what, when.

The immediate task was to create the second, very brief, document with the intent of getting the attention of citizens, raising awareness, instilling desire, and inviting action in the form of responses to the visions and initiatives offered out by the participants. Responses might be to complete a response form, attend a public meeting, host an information session, or contact a team to work with them in realizing their vision. The third report, containing recommendations for city council, would be developed following the public input.

Once again, out of chaos emerged clarity. I set about preparing a new document which was short and layered, offering streams of interest, and providing background on the rationale for developing cultural policy at all and at this time in Kitchener's community life. In four pages, I set out a precis of the initiatives and enclosed a separate, mail-back response form. In addition, we published each of the team's scenarios, including names, addresses and phone numbers to facilitate contact and made these supplemental packages available on request. The terms of reference for the CulturePlan study were published as another stand-alone piece. These layered pieces took shape in my mind following the meeting described above and in response to the concerns expressed; they took on greater clarity the following day in a meeting with the advisory committee.

In that setting, someone observed that the twenty-one initiatives grouped themselves rather naturally into six themes: festivals and celebrations, downtown core, arts and learning, new facilities, communication, and the municipal role in creating an infrastructure for culture. This insight shifted twenty-one disparate ideas into six groupings and thereby helped make the sheer volume of information more manageable to the reader. Later on, in another meeting of the advisory committee, we recognized these six themes as comprising the goals of a strategic plan. Again, this had the effect of simplifying and connecting multiple pieces into an elegant whole.

Proposals for Strengthening Culture in Kitchener

Some of the twenty-one initiatives put out for discussion and response were made-in-Kitchener versions of familiar cultural policy ideas. Examples of these are an annual arts festival (seen as complementing Oktoberfest), a children's museum, greening of the downtown, hands-on opportunities to try various arts activities, augmenting the artist-in-the-schools program, establishing a young people's community centre with drop-in arts activities, creating an outdoor amphitheatre, refurbishing the studio in The Centre in the Square, creating an information delivery system for arts and culture, expanding the city's artist-in-residence program, and establishing an artist exchange program with other communities. However, some of the other initiatives have a unique, could-only-happen-in-Kitchener feel to them.

One that fired my imagination was the proposal for a celebration of the Grand River by creating a river of fountains every few blocks along King Street from Cambridge through Kitchener to Waterloo and St. Jacobs. This would be community-created river, built over time by adding one fountain a year to those already in place:

> The fountains would flow with water in the summer, and in winter be transformed into natural gas lamps. Some would be tiny like a bird bath or drinking fountain or a tap on the wall; some grand like a waterfall. (CulturePlan, p. 15)

The originating team saw two celebrations a year built around the river of fountains: one in spring when maintenance was completed (by citizens) and the water turned on for the season; the other on November 11 when the fountains, now flowing with natural gas, would be illuminated following the memorial minute of silence. When this idea was put out for public response, some feared that it would be scoffed at. However, not only did it win support from respondents but a woman hearing about the initiative called the Parks and Recreation Department to say that she had had the sculptural elements from an historic Kitchener fountain in her garage for decades and would be willing to donate them to the city to help realize the river of fountains idea.

From the creative minds of the same scenario team came the idea of creating a series of public sculptures composed of old pieces of industrial machinery and artifacts:

> This would preserve the industrial heritage of the City of Kitchener and provide an ongoing link with the past. The sculptures (eg., punch presses, sewing machines, engine lathes, drills, etc.) could be distributed through the downtown area indoors and out, mounted on pedestals and labelled with a brief description of their former use and their provenance. They would become both an extended sculpture garden and a museum without walls--perhaps the precursor of a proper museum of industrial archaeology. (CulturePlan, p. 14)

Again, no sooner had this idea been publicized than one of its proponents heard that the Seagram's Museum in Waterloo was closing its doors and deaccessioning its collection, among which was a 1875 steam engine (not a locomotive, but an engine used as a power source before electricity). That steam engine is now installed in the second floor rotunda of city hall labelled with details of its contribution to the industrial history of Kitchener. Subsequently, many similar donations have been obtained, and several of the artifacts installed. One, an eight-foot tall plastic thermosetting press, was installed in an outdoor green on the occasion of its naming as a memorial tribute to the councillor who helped secure approval for CulturePlan and its outcomes.

A third example of a unique and imaginative initiative from the same scenario team was to create back alley galleries as part of laneway development in the downtown:

> Interested artists, landlords, and tenants working together would use everyday materials and processes to create visually appealing pocket galleries, incorporating features such as sculptures, carvings, painting, and greenery irrigated by collected rainwater. (CulturePlan, p. 17)

This initiative didn't capture the public imagination in quite the same way as the previous two, however neither was it rejected by the public or the civic administration. The idea has continued to live in the minds of the Downtown Task Force, which has committed to acting upon it when a proposed laneway development invites such treatment.

Among the various festivals and celebrations envisioned was one centred around production of Richard Wagner's "Ring Cycle." Given the German background of the Kitchener area (the city's original name was Berlin) and the presence of an excellent orchestra and equally impressive performance facility, the proponents revived a long-standing dream of the founders of The Centre in the Square, proposing to present the complete cycle of four operas over a period of several years as a Kitchener contribution to the major neighbouring festivals of Shaw, Stratford, Guelph and Elora. This idea has yet to be acted upon, although it persists.

Tying many of the initiatives together, at least in the minds of the team members proposing it, was the idea to create a "Kilometre of Culture" in downtown Kitchener:

> This would be an area of the core where existing and future arts facilities and attractions are integrated into a lively and vibrant downtown and linked with a marked walkway and various amenities such as fountains and murals. . . . The Kilometre of Culture is not dependent on the City funding and operating it; rather, it will become a reality through the participation of a wide spectrum of funding opportunities in the private sector, public sector, and charitable and nonprofit sector. (CulturePlan, p. 16)

The members of the Kilometre of Culture scenario group have remained active in promoting the concept, working with the civic administration and the Downtown Task Force in drawing the map, planning signage, and preparing two self-guided walking tours of the downtown arts zone.

Citizen Action

The five initiatives described above are illustrative not only of the unique and imaginative responses by Kitchener citizens to the invitation to invent the future of culture in Kitchener, but also of initiatives enacted cooperatively between the citizen proponents and the civic corporation. There is another delightful initiative of

CulturePlan which stands alone as wholly enacted by the participants. From the same scenario team as the river of fountains, industrial artifacts, and laneway galleries came a desire to see continuation of "the many fruitful interactions that began during the CulturePlan process" (CulturePlan, p. 24). Periodic Salons or informal receptions focused on arts and culture:

> would help to promote public interest in the arts . . . . A performance or lecture at the beginning would focus the evening; the reception time following would enable conversation about current projects and concerns among artists and persons interested in the arts. (CulturePlan, p. 24)

The first salon was organized by the proponents; the second was one of the open houses held during the public consultation phase of CulturePlan. Then, at another outreach information meeting that focused on downtown and business interests, the manager of a heritage hotel in downtown Kitchener heard the idea of periodic salons and realized that she had a contribution to make. Denise Strong approached a CulturePlan participant saying that the second floor Barristers' Lounge "hadn't seen a barrister in years" --"Why not hold an arts and letters club there every Thursday evening?" she asked. The hotel would contribute the space, hors d'oeuvres and nonalcoholic punch, while patrons could organize the evening's activities for themselves.

Seventy people were present at the inaugural gathering before the CulturePlan report had even gone to city council, and the gatherings continue under the name "The Berlin Circle" three full years later. Numbers have varied from as few as twenty to as many as two hundred. A newsletter appeared, outings have been organized, live radio broadcasts originate from the Berlin Circle, milestones in the implementation of CulturePlan are celebrated, and the annual check-up of progress on CulturePlan is held in conjunction with the Berlin Circle. I rejoice in this outcome not just because it was enacted entirely by citizens out of their experience of CulturePlan but because it is evidence of the presence of community now where it had been so absent at the start.

Council Action

The rest of the story of CulturePlan belongs to the city council and civic administration. Concurrent with the outreach to the public, an inreach was undertaken with members of various city departments and agencies, as well as with citizen advisors in the sister cities of Cambridge and Waterloo. Just as the work of the scenarios teams had been offered to the public for response, so we offered it to the people within the city who would help the ideas happen or hinder their happening. Some of the initiatives were directed at the city. Others could only be accomplished with the involvement of the city. Some were quite outside the experience or even wildest dreams of department managers. However, it was in these discussions that the plausibility and even the excitement of possibilities began to take shape in the minds of senior staff. One general manager protested when I, being sensitive to his time constraints, tried to end a meeting after a full hour; seldom, he said, did he get to be a part of anything so imaginative, stimulating, and wholly positive. Even the head of public works, while cautioning that he didn't see how the same pipes could carry both water and natural gas, was intrigued by the idea of a river of fountains. This series of meetings served to establish that there were no regulations or bylaws--and no attitudinal road blocks--standing in the way of any of the proposed initiatives, not even back alley galleries. The meetings also helped me formulate recommendations which would serve to kick-start each initiative while being within the capacity of the city to take action. Consequently, when the report was prepared, its recommendations were possible and plausible. In twenty-five pages (plus appendices), we set out for council the background to CulturePlan (with the envisioning process described in a footnote); the vision, values and principles to guide cultural development; and six goals for cultural development, together with the initiatives, actions and recommendations to realize those goals. The report was cogent and readable, a distillation of the community's imaginative work. And it came to city council with the added endorsement that citizens had already begun to take action on these plans, which they owned. This fact was stressed in the presentation made to city council by CulturePlan participants.

The Treasure Chest

June 17, 1996. Location: City Hall. An evening meeting of the council sitting as the Community Services Committee. Handsome, silver-haired, formally-attired director of ceremonies steps to the podium. It is the citizen chair of CulturePlan, who begins formally to update council on the project's progress. Lights dim. Doors open to a fiddler, leading a mime artist and others carrying a treasure chest laden with gifts from project participants to the community. The presentation begins.

The mime lifts from the trunk and delivers to the mayor an invoice for the $45,000 of citizen time invested in CulturePlan; the invoice is marked "paid in full." Next the mime extracts from the trunk an invitation to the Berlin Circle, which hotel manager Denise Strong delivers to a councillor while the director of ceremonies describes the weekly arts and letters gatherings which are already under way. Then the mime pulls out an oversized cheque, written to the city from a local corporation, in the amount of $2,000. A representative of Mutual Group delivers the cheque to a councillor known to focus on the bottom line, while the director of ceremonies explains that the sponsorship was obtained by a CulturePlan participant so that the city's artist-in-residence might be paid an honorarium in addition to having use of studio space. The mime then pulls out an admission button for the upcoming ArtsWorks visual arts celebration, another of the initiatives of CulturePlan already on the way to realization. While the mime pins the family admission button onto a councillor who has children, the director of ceremonies explains how the festival will help attract people, especially families, downtown.

Lastly the mime retrieves from the bottom of the trunk the treasure being offered to the city in the form of the CulturePlan report, each copy decorated with brightly coloured ribbons. While the mime distributes each of the twelve copies of the report in an idiosyncratic way, the director of ceremonies invites councillors to read the document prior to their meeting when the recommendations will be discussed in a fortnight's time. This theatrical presentation of what was in form a plain printed text captured the attention of the councillors and spoke to the caring and creativity of those involved in its preparation, even in the very short-term actions of delivering the

CulturePlan report to council.

Outcomes

City council adopted the report in its entirety, requiring only that initiatives involving capital or operating expenditures beyond approved budgets be brought back for separate consideration. Specifically, council approved the recommendations directed at strengthening the city's infrastructure: adopting the vision, core values, and principles to guide cultural development; adopting the six goals (and later incorporating them into the general municipal plan); establishing the arts and culture advisory committee on a permanent basis; mandating a participatory process for reviewing progress on CulturePlan goals annually; and approving in principle establishment of a storefront for city arts and culture operations. Eventually council also budgeted an honorarium for the city's artist-in-residence. Other initiatives seeing progress have been commented on above.

Using the yardsticks of citizen and corporate action applied in the previous chapter to the Cultural Futures Project, CulturePlan was impressive on both counts. These twin pillars of action had been emphasized from the start, not just by me but by participants as well. I recall several occasions when participants challenged one another, sometimes within teams and sometimes between teams, not to conceive of the action as being taken by someone else but by themselves. The best work of the project resulted in initiatives realized through citizen effort supported by civic encouragement, resources, or direct assistance. Those yet to be realized await the right opportunity for an appropriate partnership to swing into action. Any initiative whose proponents cease to work toward it will disappear from the radar screen of the city administration. Conversely even unlikely initiatives, such as the museum of industrial archaeology, progress steadily because their proponents continue to recognize and take hold of opportunities to enact their visions.

In the case of Kitchener, the city did end up with several important elements of a cultural strategic plan which have the effect of continuing the momentum of cultural development into the future. An important one is the existence of a permanent arts and culture advisory committee. The advisory committee was given, as part of its ongoing mandate, responsibility to annually review progress on CulturePlan goals with the community and to revise and update the goals as initiatives are accomplished and needs change.

Another legacy of CulturePlan is the incorporation into the general municipal plan of the goals for cultural development. In this way, the goals have become part of the civic corporation's planning guidelines and regulatory mechanisms. Not present in the general municipal plan but certainly in the awareness of the advisory committee and CulturePlan participants are a remarkable set of values and principles pertaining to cultural development. One of the values is "imagination as an infinitely renewable resource . . . and the desire to bring this capacity to bear on the seemingly intractable problems not solved by our current approaches" (CulturePlan, p. 4). Another value is:

> the particular gift of the original creative artist in bringing into sharper and clearer focus the societal dissonances and aspirations that play upon us all but go unrecognized until we pause to reflect in response to a provocative or inspiring piece of art. (CulturePlan, p. 5)

In these values and the principles adopted by council, artists and arts supporters are affirmed in their sense that they have value as contributors to the life of the city overall, not just in the arts per se.

Conclusions

From reading the monthly minutes of the Arts and Culture Advisory Committee, I see that CulturePlan as a set of specific initiatives is close to being exhausted after only three years. Many of the initiatives have been realized or are being realized, while others are evidently nonstarters for the time being. However, the presence of a permanent set of advisors, goals, values, principles, and an annual participatory process for reviewing and updating the plan ensure that cultural development thrusts forward. There are two additional causes for optimism that I see in the minutes of the committee. One is that new members for the committee are being drawn from the ranks of CulturePlan participants. Another is that there is evidence that participants have not been content to see the CulturePlan initiatives as an end state of cultural planning, but have continued to float new images and work to enact them. And beyond the committee and CulturePlan participants, I am most impressed by the evidence of nurturing, celebrating, and creative community. This may be the most significant legacy of the CulturePlan project, one directly attributable in my mind to the use of the envisioning approach.

With this and the Edmonton Cultural Futures Project case studies available for reference, I will return to the examples of more traditional policy development reviewed in Chapter 2 and the public policy challenges posed in Chapter 3 to consider whether the envisioning approach constitutes an alternative policy process and, if so, to what extent it might address some of the issues and opportunities raised by current writings about policy. I will do this by examining in turn the four features of envisioning which seem to me to distinguish it from more typical approaches to policy formulation identified at the conclusion of Chapter 4. These features are participant self-selection; determination of policy issues as part of policy development; introduction of a structured, imaginative, co-creative process; and a remelding of policy formulation and implementation. These four features will also provide the matrix for my assessment of the comparative success of the Kitchener and Edmonton projects.

Chapter 7

Envisioning Canadian Cities: An Alternative Cultural Policy Process

In Chapters 2 and 3, I reviewed five instances of cultural policy development undertaken during the past decade in English-speaking Canadian cities. While each was particular to its location and situation, all made use of a task force of appointed individuals to research and consult regarding predetermined policy issues and to prepare policy recommendations for implementation by existing civic agencies. This is a traditional model for policy making.

Does envisioning constitute an alternative approach to policy development and implementation? I contend that there are four aspects of envisioning which substantively differ from traditional approaches to policy production as embodied in the examples of Vancouver, Toronto, Calgary, Edmonton and Greater Vancouver. These differences have to do with who participates in policy production (and who decides who participates), who defines the issues to be addressed, what process is used to arrive at policy proposals, and how implementation is conceived and achieved. Taken together, these differences constitute a radical approach to policy and, in my mind, may begin to address some of the challenges and opportunities posed in current thinking about public policy.

Who Participates in Policy Production? And Who Decides?

One notable feature of envisioning which sets it apart from traditional approaches to policy is that participants in an envisioning policy process are not selected and appointed by an existing hierarchy, but select and, in effect, appoint themselves to take part. We have seen that the spirit and mechanics of this practice are challenging to bureaucratic organizations, perhaps because it is such an inversion of standard procedure. Normally someone in the policy hierarchy identifies persons who, by virtue of their past involvement and knowledge, are seen as qualified and appropriate to undertake the policy task at hand. These persons might include elected officials, staff, citizens representative of a various sectors of the community, or sometimes a paid consultant. The persons so selected are usually confirmed by the mandating body as suitable to the task, implying that the policy hierarchy trusts the selected persons to carry out the task in a way that will be acceptable to it. Principles undergirding this approach include representation, credentialling, expertise, continuity, and control.

The envisioning procedure of having persons self-select in response to an open invitation is not just an alternative approach to finding task force members but a different way of deciding who is to be involved in policy production. It rests on the principle that the future is the domain of intention and action, rather than knowledge; and therefore it is not expertise or credentials that are sought in policy participants, but desire and intent. Only the person knows her desire and intent, and so each person must determine for herself if she will participate.

This approach has the effect of removing policy development from elected leaders to whom, according to Phillips (1991), we are no longer prepared to entrust it, and engaging instead the "acting individuals" whom Carlsson sees as germane to the policy process (1996, p. 537). The rest of the community might ask, "Who are you to undertake policy?" since these persons are not elected as representatives of the people. My response is that they are the people who care enough to invest the time and considerable energy required to approach policy in this way. A more frequent question I hear as an envisioning facilitator is, "Who are we to be doing this?" expressing concern for those who are "not here," those who did not accept the invitation. My response is the same; we are the ones who care enough to invest the considerable time and energy required to undertake policy in this way. By this response, I do not intend to supplant representative democracy with government by activists but to loosen the grip of formulaic approaches to representation and argue for commitment and intent as valid criteria for participation in policy production.

Invitation and self-selection may be a way to achieve a flexible, nonprescriptive involvement of "multiplicities of interests and identities" as called for by Stevenson (1998, p. 137). In this regard, the two case studies demonstrate that envisioning has the potential to incorporate diverse interests and identities, though that potential was incompletely realized. There was, for example, one participant of aboriginal ancestry in the Cultural Futures Project in a city where a significant portion of the population is aboriginal; and in Kitchener, there were no persons of colour and only one person recognized by the others as "young." When the invitation can be extended in such a way as to be heard by those who do not normally see themselves as part of cultural policy production, the envisioning approach has the potential to include a multiplicity of voices.

Self-selection by participants and their engagement as persons rather than as representatives or spokespeople may also begin to address other concerns raised by Stevenson and Phillips. Stevenson asks if it is "possible for interest groups other than those of business and commerce to shape urban policy in a more direct way" (1998, p. 137), and wonders about the terrain beyond that covered by existing collectives, especially when the collectives embrace or are assigned a reactive or protest stance. The envisioning protocol of having participants self-select gives an avenue for many people, affiliated or not, to involve themselves in policy production, and to do so on the basis of their personhood, not their group allegiance. This same feature has the effect of shifting momentum away from groups which have a single-issue advocacy focus and from groups who have an oppositional rather than a co-creative stance. All participants are called upon to offer concrete policy alternatives rather than merely what Phillips refers to as reactive criticism (1991). Even Phillips's long-range concern about policy partnerships, that they may "truncate or obscure the range of interest representation and public criticism" (1991, p. 211), can be obviated by the open and participatory practice of citizens selecting themselves for involvement in response to an open invitation.

Are there limitations to an approach in which citizens select their own involvement on the basis of their intent and willingness to commit the time and energy? Yes. There are logistical limitations in terms of how many people can be accommodated within budgets, timelines, venues and other practical considerations faced by the sponsor of a policy project. There are very real risks to the sponsoring body in terms of trust and willingness to give up control. There are heavy demands on the participants in terms of time and energy, and the risk that their work will be rejected rather than honoured at the end. However, in the case of Kitchener at least, none of these potential inhibiting factors appreciably constrained or distorted the work that was done, and the outcomes exceeded expectations to a degree commensurate with the risks borne.

Were there some differences in the invitation and self-selection processes of the Kitchener project which would account for its relative success? Certainly there was nothing in the profile or creativity of the Kitchener participants to set them apart from the Edmonton participants. However the terms on which members in each group came to be participants might have subtly influenced their subsequent expectations of themselves and others. As we saw, the Edmonton cultural policy committee proceeded by delineating stakeholder sectors of the community, and approached key organizations in those sectors to identify persons who might take part in an initial workshop to identify concerns and resources for cultural development. The persons who attended were then asked to name other persons known to them (including themselves, if they wished) who might meet the criterion of being creative, informed and concerned about culture. This process may have yielded participants who had a stakeholder hat to wear, either because they saw themselves as having a stake or because they felt obligated to an organization or person who had put their names forward.

Kitchener's arts and culture advisory committee did not need to follow a two-step process because they had available a comprehensive list of organizations and persons interested in culture and were able to approach all of them directly with a letter of invitation. This may have yielded persons who felt themselves to be participants by virtue of their own involvement rather than as an organization or sector representative.

Ironically, during the outreach and formal debate phases of the Edmonton project, where one might have expected the representational affiliation of participants to be useful in bridging gaps to persons who had not been directly involved in the project, it seemed to have the opposite effect. That is to say, strong opposition to the initiatives was forthcoming from some of the very groups whose own executive members had been full participants in conceiving those initiatives. This was true of both the elite sport community and the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. In Kitchener, the absence or relative invisibility of associational affiliation did not play a significant positive or negative role in outreach or approval debates.

Who Defines the Issues for Policy?

Closely related to the protocol of having participants elect their own participation in policy production is the feature of envisioning in which policy issues are determined by participants as part of their work together, rather than predetermined by the policy hierarchy. In each of the five examples we scrutinized in Chapters 2 and 3, the task force was given a set of policy issues to address in its work. The issues had been determined in advance by the policy hierarchy and assigned to the task force in its mandating guidelines. This contrasts with the envisioning mode, in which the issues brought to the table by the participants themselves are the ones addressed in policy development. The initial work for envisioners is to uncover their concerns and dissatisfactions--however defined, about culture--however defined. Thus the issues receiving policy attention in envisioning are the concerns brought by participants and owned by them as significant within their experience. For this reason, one may see in a cultural policy report a recommendation concerned with water quality in the local river, as happened in the Edmonton Cultural Futures Project.

Again, I do not consider this simply another way of identifying policy issues, any more than self-selection is another way of recruiting task force members. Rather, I see the identification and ownership of issues for policy development by participants as a substantively different approach to policy. It speaks of the principle of the person who owns a concern or problem being the one entitled and obliged to take action on it and, conversely, of the inappropriateness of someone's formulating policy or action to address a concern not owned by them. One writer who seemed to be intimating such a view of issue definition was Carlsson, when he advocated a nonhierarchical approach to policy analysis in which a researcher looks to discover "who is participating in the creation of institutional arrangements in order to solve [some policy problem]" (1996, p. 535). Here Carlsson links the identification of, and action on, a problem to the same group. These groupings he names as "implementation structures" (1996, p. 533), structures which are "understandable only with reference to the problem to be solved" (1996, p. 537). That is, neither the issue nor the grouping is prescribed by the policy hierarchy, but both take shape for purposes of solving a shared policy problem. Presumably policy interests that are often privileged, such as business and commerce (Stevenson, 1998), are not automatically deferred to when issues are defined and implementation structures formed, but they are elements in the mix of concerns emerging from the lived experiences of all participants.

Another way of not predetermining the issues to be addressed is by not imposing a definition of culture. The word culture serves initially as a label sufficiently communicative to attract participants whose concerns are in a domain to which they would attach the term "culture," but beyond that participants are free to use whatever are their operative definitions of culture, until by identifying specific issues and images, the participants discover together how they understand culture. Effectively they end up defining culture afresh, and collectively, for themselves rather than relying on received definitions. In this approach, perhaps they reject, with Carlsson, the "assumption that 'someone else' has constructed a suitable analytic screen" for their policy production (1996, p. 542). By leaving open to participants the determination of the issues to be addressed and the meaning of culture, the sponsoring agency does not prescribe a meaning system within which participants must fit their work but leaves the terrain of exploration as open as possible to the discovery of new possibilities through the imaginative process of imaging.

Both the Edmonton and Kitchener projects left the defining of culture and the identification of issues to be addressed to the participants as part of their work together. In the case of the Cultural Futures Project, however, the backlog of long-standing and intractable issues was a threat, in the eyes of the advisory board, to the long term initiatives being heard by the larger community (T. MacDougall, personal communication, July 5, 1999). Indirectly, the progress of the project was affected by these surrounding issues, even though the issues were not those identified by the participants in and for their work together. That the Kitchener CulturePlan project did not have an equivalent burden to carry may account in some measure for its much more positive reception. Perhaps so little political attention had been given to arts and culture to that time, and the amount of funding provided was so much less that the participants had in effect a blank slate on which to inscribe their concerns and vision, and the project sponsors were prepared to receive participants' concerns as those to be addressed.

The Process for Arriving at Policy Proposals

A third distinctive feature of the envisioning approach to policy is the application of a structured, imaginative and cocreative process to the task of inventing policy proposals which go beyond that which is already known. In traditional approaches to policy formulation, various forms of research and data gathering might be undertaken as input to the moment of creating policy proposals and various forms of analysis and prioritization might contribute to clarifying the options; however, the moment of creation is the black box of the policy sequence, a hidden and mysterious moment of chance and serendipity. Certainly, whenever good policy proposals are birthed, a creative act of the imagination has leapt the gap from multiple possibilities to the one best option. In envisioning, such creative acts of the imagination are deliberately invited, the ground is prepared with protocols for precipitating and recognizing them, and the likelihood of their happening is increased by having everyone engage in the creative search.

As with the other distinctive features of an envisioning approach to policy, I see the introduction of a specific, structured, imaginative process as a substantive difference, not just an alternative way of generating policy options to consider. Envisioning goes beyond merely considering what has already been thought or tried to creating the potential for something entirely new to enter the realm of human possibility. It does this by engaging the imaginative and spiritual capacities of all participants and, in so doing, seeks to bring to bear on policy issues not just the ideas and knowledge of the participants but their intentions. It shifts the focus away from an assumption of resource scarcity toward a stance of resource abundance by considering resources to be not solely, or even mainly, financial but also conceptual. From the realm of the imagination, new stories can appear and visions take hold which are more than rearrangements of existing parts, but new creations.[19]

The envisioning approach to policy, besides seeking to create the possibility for newness to enter, provides for a creative upward distillation of the images which emerge. This is unlike brainstorming and idea collecting processes in which all ideas are run through successive sortings until what remains is either a lowest common denominator or a generalization in which individual contributions may no longer be recognizable. In envisioning, as individuals form scenario groupings on the basis of their images of the future and build scenarios collaboratively, each person's original work is knit into a composite which is owned by the whole while still maintaining fidelity to each individual's compelling image. In this way the tension between individual images and the shared vision is maintained, neither eclipsing the other. When teams seek shared vision with each other by a similar process, the upward distillation continues. These qualities of the cocreative process at the heart of envisioning may begin to address some of the challenges and opportunities raised in current thinking about public policy.

Several of the concerns articulated by Phillips are spoken to by the creative process at the heart of envisioning. Phillips noted the challenge of "reconcil[ing] divergent opinions into a single report that can be a useful input into policy-making" (1991, p. 193). The upward distillation of images to scenarios, and of scenarios to shared vision, results in a coherent set of policy offerings. These constitute concrete policy alternatives, not merely reactive criticism or opposition, another of Phillips's concerns (1991, p. 194). Phillips expressed a third concern having to do not with the substance of policy but with the conduct of citizens engaged in advocacy. Phillips worried that, in contrast to professional lobbyists, citizen groups might be awkward and unprofessional in presenting their views (1991, p. 189). I have observed that the protocols of envisioning serve not only to assist participants in clarifying their visions and goals, and so speaking clearly about them, but they also serve to channel passion and conviction into constructive and respectful communication.

The cocreative process at the heart of envisioning may also begin to address some considerations raised by Magnusson. In urging us not to think of the municipality as a sovereign political space but as a contingent and limited entity, Magnusson reminds us that we "have to come to terms with a multiplicity of worlds and histories--spaces and times--that make up the political conditions we face" (1996, p. 7). It seems to me that the envisioning process of knitting individual images together into shared visions, and allowing futures-histories and action steps to grow out of the various scenarios is an acknowledgement of the need for multiple rather than single solutions, possibilities rather than imperatives. The difficult but inspiring work of building shared visions out of individual images is one way of "considering claims in relation to one another. . . see[ing] connections between problems, the commonalities in the solutions" (1996, p. 114). Magnusson's insistence that those solutions be practical and concrete rather than theoretical and abstract (1996, p. 8) resonates with the envisioning emphasis on having images that are concrete and specific, tastable and touchable, livable in the imagination, and ultimately in the present. This is the purpose of inviting teams to enact their scenarios for each other--to demonstrate that they can live in, and live out, their futures in the present because those futures are real and compelling in their imaginations.

One other concern of Magnusson's speaks to me of the potential of envisioning as a creative process at the heart of policy-making. Magnusson cautions against supplanting one set of sovereignty-thinking for another, asking

> whether we can constitute our activities without reifying them; give them form and presence while ensuring that they don't become things that dominate our lives; open possibilities without foreclosing our means to reconstitute our activities in accordance with our changing needs and desires. (1996, p. 101)

There is an aspect of envisioning which I feel can achieve exactly this balance between creation and ongoing re-creation. It is the availability, not of vision per se, but of a process for generating vision. In other words what is most valuable about envisioning is not the vision generated by any person at any particular moment but the capacity and competence to continually envision. When this capacity and competence--and the intention--are shared by a group of people, they can unfold an ongoing, ever-contingent, always provisional stream of new possibilities, rendering into concrete form those that serve for the moment, and reconstituting them for the next moment not according to whim but in accord with the source of images deep within. There is something life-giving about such a process which ever opens new vistas, gives form and presence, and does not foreclose on emerging concerns or new images.

Before I leave the creative process at the heart of the envisioning approach to policy, I would like to comment on one other aspect of its appropriateness, particularly to developing policy for culture. The creative process at the heart of envisioning seems to be the same as the creative process of the artist.[20] That process begins with a sense of something no longer satisfying or tantalizingly possible. It proceeds to an imagined conception of a new state which is not an extrapolation but a gestalt, and that new state is given concrete form in the world. If this insight is valid, then it would be appropriate that this approach to policy issues in culture echoes the process by means of which an artist creates. Too often the policy issues of culture are addressed through modes of strategic planning and problem solving which are foreign to the artistic process. In envisioning, the imaginal life is affirmed, and the particular gift of the creative artist is honoured by participants engaging it for their policy work.

Considering specifically the Edmonton and Kitchener case studies, again we ask if there are any aspects of the collaborative, intentional process at the heart of envisioning which worked differently in one place from the other, and might account for the relative success of the Kitchener CulturePlan. For me, the answer is yes. I have already alluded to some of the differences, including the lapsed time between workshops, and our having put the Edmonton scenario material out for public review prematurely. Both actions diminished the momentum which had been so evident in the initial two-day envisioning conference of the Cultural Futures Project. By contrast, in Kitchener, the two, two-day workshops were three weeks apart and the outreach material had been rigorously critiqued and shaped prior to publication both by the participants collectively and by the advisory committee. As a consequence, momentum was maintained in Kitchener and public response to the materials was far more positive and easier for teams and the advisory committee to incorporate.

In addition to these differences between the Edmonton and Kitchener projects, there were several differences related to design and facilitation of the envisioning. In the Edmonton project, concerns were identified by one group of participants and the imaging was done by another group of participants, with some overlap. This modification of the normal envisioning sequence was a result of the overall project design necessitated by the two-stage process of finding participants. I cannot say how this modification affected the imaging of alternative futures, but it may have been a contributing factor to the later lack of action on their visions by the participants themselves. By contrast, in the Kitchener CulturePlan, the same persons articulated their concerns for culture and imaged the concerns well addressed. This ownership both of concerns and of the related images may have been a factor in CulturePlan participants' taking action on their own visions and sustaining the action over time.

In general, the CulturePlan design was pared down compared to the Edmonton project. The analytical work done in Edmonton by subgroups of participants was done in Kitchener either by participants directly (which was feasible given the smaller number) or by the advisory board. Some of the success of the Kitchener CulturePlan measured in action taken by participants and in terms of positive reception when the recommendations entered the formal political arena may be attributable to this difference.

In addition to the differences of process mentioned above, the two projects were facilitated by different persons. Again, I cannot assess whether and how different outcomes might have been attributable to different facilitators. I know that Ziegler and I have very different styles of presenting envisioning and of interacting with participants. We also vary greatly in the amount of experience we have had at facilitating envisioning projects. The only meaningful comparison I can make is between the person I was in 1988, directing the Edmonton project, and the person I was in 1995-96, designing and facilitating the Kitchener project. By the time of the Kitchener project, I had the benefit of the Edmonton project plus ensuing years of facilitating envisioning in many settings. Also important was the considerable increase in my knowledge and experience of the workings of municipal government. It is perhaps this latter learning that enabled me to help see and make the connections in Kitchener between the aspirations of the envisioners and the existing organizations, structures, policies, and programs within which their envisioned actions needed to gain a toehold in the present.

Policy Implementation

In Chapter 3 I began to explore, through the writings of Carlsson and others, notions of policy production in which implementation is not separated from policy formulation, but the two are components each of the other and are undertaken in an iterative fashion. In Chapter 6 I documented a degree of integration between policy development and implementation in the Kitchener CulturePlan. This feature of envisioning, the nonseparation of policy development-and-implementation, is another of the features which, at least potentially, sets the envisioning approach to policy apart from more traditional approaches. While such integration of policy development and implementation is not always achieved, we saw in CulturePlan the potential for participants to take ownership of their scenarios and enact them, either independently or in conjunction with agencies of the civic government. The invitation for participants to take ownership and follow through with action is part of the process from the start. This is in contrast to the more traditional approaches to policy where one group of people develops policy for another group to implement. Carlsson's concept of implementation structures offers one way of thinking about how envisioning achieves an integration, or nonseparation, of policy development and implementation.

Carlsson defines implementation structures as "groups of people trying to solve a policy problem" (1996, p. 533), with no requirement that the policy hierarchy participate in the process. Presumably these groups form spontaneously in response to a shared recognition that there is a policy problem their members want to solve, as suggested by Carlsson's observation that "they are forming a structure which is understandable only with reference to the problem to be solved" (1996, p. 537). Rather than awaiting the spontaneous recognition of a shared policy problem, might such groups be invited to form prior to, and as an integral part of, policy formulation-and-implementation? Would we then have the scenario teams which come into being in envisioning?

One difference to note is that in envisioning, scenario teams come together not on the basis of shared concern (a policy problem) but on the basis of shared images of a future in which the concerns are well addressed. From there, the group develops its policy responses and discerns the actions which the members are prepared to take on behalf of their shared vision. These actions are tested in the crucible of the team, then with coenvisioners, then with the wider community, and eventually in the formal political arena. If the vision is still owned by participants at that point, they will enact the vision in the ongoing present, revising and reformulating as they go. This action can be independent of the policy hierarchy, as with the Berlin Circle initiative of CulturePlan; it can be wholly an action of the policy hierarchy, as in the infrastructural initiatives of CulturePlan; or it can be a joint endeavour of citizens and the policy hierarchy, as in the industrial artifacts and several other initiatives of CulturePlan.

Given that this melding of planning and action is a potential inherent in envisioning, how do we account for the potential being realized to a large degree in Kitchener and not being substantially realized in Edmonton? Here I think we might look to a combination of internal and external factors. Internal factors I have already examined within the respective case studies: our relative failure in the case of Edmonton, and relative success in the case of Kitchener, in uncovering and maintaining ownership of concerns, images, and action; in conceiving short-term action which had both fidelity to the vision and a toehold in present structures and practices; and in offering the recommendations in such a way that persons who were not part of the project could hear their own concerns and visions reflected there.

There are also some external factors which I feel may account for the relative success of the Kitchener CulturePlan in this matter of policy making and implementation. In Edmonton, cultural policy had become strongly politicized during the previous decade of policy enquiries which, in the view of affected organizations and individuals, had not gone anywhere. Related to this was a polarization of organizations in the cultural realm: arts groups, multicultural groups, sports groups, and community leagues. Each had come to see the others as being in competition for the same limited resources and not as allies in increasing the total resources available to culture. Compounding these tensions was the mood of the city at the time. At the end of the 1980s Edmonton was experiencing a crisis of self-confidence, feeling that the glory days of its championship sports teams and international sporting events had faded, especially in contrast to Calgary, which was that year hosting the Winter Olympics. Public perception was that the city council was not business-friendly, and that we were losing corporate national offices as well as financial prosperity.[21]

Not Policy at All?

One might ask, given the features of envisioning articulated above and my claim that they are matters not merely of form but of substance, whether envisioning is properly contained within the rubric of policy at all, and if not, what is it that people are doing when they envision in the context of a citizen project? This is a question which repeatedly asserts itself within me as I work with citizen groups, and one that I expect will continue to engage me. As a conclusion to this chapter, I would like to explore that question from three angles suggested by the writings of Phillips, Magnusson and Bianchini.

Often when I am approached by a municipality to facilitate the development of cultural policy, the spokesperson or the terms of reference will emphasize the requirement for a public consultation component. In offering the envisioning approach, I am in essence combining the policy development component with public consultation by having citizens actively involved in identifying issues and developing policy proposals. Already this takes us a step beyond what is traditionally meant by consultation, that is, an exchange of information (Phillips, 1991). For Phillips, what is beyond consultation is partnership of various kinds. Phillips defines a partnership as "collaborative joint action in an effort to solve a problem" (1991, p. 206). We recognize this definition as very reminiscent of Carlsson's implementation structures; however, Carlsson is providing for the possibility that the state may not be a player, while Phillips is referring specifically to partnerships between citizens (especially citizens' groups) and the state. Phillips offers a typology of partnerships, varying in the degree of their relative autonomy of decision making and action. In each of Phillips's partnerships, from consultative partnerships to contributory partnerships, community development partnerships, and collaborative partnerships, the participants are carefully selected. They are representative of organizational constituencies, and the partnerships they form are intended to maintain a specific shape through time. Envisioning may be a form of collaboration, but it is a fluid and dynamic one in which participants self-select; they participate as persons rather than representatives, and the form and duration of the collaboration are not prescribed. Also, the collaboration embodied in envisioning may not necessarily include the state although, in the two case studies described here, it does. One way I have come to think of envisioning is that participants constitute for the occasion a civitas, a node of civil society in which people engage themselves and one another in conceiving desirable futures, that is, alternatives to present practices, in which to dwell. Perhaps this is what Magnusson means by his phrase "creating political space" (1996).

Envisioning as Creating Political Space

> To create a political space is to establish a domain for public action in which various positions and, hence, various relationships and identities become possible, and others are implicity excluded. (Magnusson, 1996, p. 355)

Magnusson asserts that the space for politics is not just there but must be created and that these spaces need to be free and not sovereign, where "people could present themselves to one another and engage in actions that respected one another's autonomy" (1996, p. 4). For Magnusson, such a space is not dominated and cannot be dominated by a single entity with a sovereign will, and is not understandable in terms of only one set of claims or one version of reality. Further describing the free spaces for popular democratic action, Magnusson draws the analogy between sovereign spaces of the state and sealed identities in personal life, observing that both may be a "fixation that can obstruct the practices that are required to secure people's objectives" (1996, p. 113). Magnusson concludes that "creative politics depends on opening up sealed identities and forming new possibilities" (1996, p. 113). He is aware that not everyone feels dissatisfaction with the political spaces available to them: "For those who see little wrong with the world, the existing political spaces may be perfectly satisfactory" (1996, p. 47).

How closely do the spaces created by envisioning match the qualities of spaces for political action described by Magnusson? In the best occasions for envisioning, I think they match quite closely. Envisioning invites persons to constitute a civitas, a new node of civil society, for the duration of a project and perhaps longer. It is a space where the insufficiency of any one claim or any one solution is quickly seen, as we listen to images which, while they may be very different from our own, are nevertheless equally engaging to their proponents as my image is to me. Without abandoning that which is compelling to them individually, envisioners seek shared vision with others and undertake the difficult task of building scenarios of the future in which multiple claims are honoured and actions respect each other's autonomy. In the contingent and provisional nature of visions and actions, participants can acknowledge the presence of multiple interests and identities within themselves as well as within the group. When participants create their new action settings, they are "lay[ing] claim to a political space that may or may not conform to the spaces allowed by the existing system of government" (Magnusson, 1996, p. 10).

A good part of the tension I bear as facilitator in an envisioning policy project sponsored by a government has to do with keeping the envisioning space--both the inner, imaginal space, and the outer, political space--protected and open. When the space is genuinely free and uncolonized, as in Kitchener, the initiatives offered and enacted by the citizens will be ones genuinely owned by them. When the space is impinged upon, as was true to a great degree in the Cultural Futures Project, the initiatives are more likely to conform to the state at the expense of fidelity to the citizens' images and intentions. Envisioning has the potential to open, and hold open, space for democratic political action. In this way, it realizes one of the goals Bianchini holds for urban cultural policy: "to help cities function once again as genuinely democratic public domains and catalysts for public social life" (1993b, p. 199).

Cities, Citizenship, and Cultural Policy

Bianchini's hopes for cultural policy in the 1990s are that it would move into a phase in which the formerly dominant view of cities as physical and economic entities would be replaced by a more balanced and nuanced view of cities as cultural entities having cultural and symbolic as well as economic, environmental, social, and political dimensions. Cultural policy, to be effective, would have a positive impact in all of these dimensions, not merely in the economic or physical ones. Such a cultural policy would rest on a definition of culture as a way of life that "integrates the arts into other aspects of local culture and into the textures and routines of daily life in the city" (Bianchini, 1993b, p. 209). Quality of life would be assessed in terms of "how residents relate to their city as a collective entity and how they participate in its public life" (1993b, pp. 210-211). Immigrant communities and other disadvantaged social groups contribute their unique perspectives, and urban social movements contribute their energies, resources, and ideas to a more robust debate about the future of the city. Thus cultural policy strengthens citizenship and local democracy. How might that happen? Bianchini does not propose any methods by which such ambitious goals for cultural policy might be realized. Perhaps in envisioning we can glimpse a mode in which citizenship and democracy are not only the desired outcomes of cultural policy, as they are for Bianchini, but are manifested in the very process of cultural policy production.

Through this lens we might view all the familiar features of envisioning: participants electing their own participation, articulating their individual concerns, generating images of the concerns well addressed, entering into an honest search for others with whom vision is shared (a process of milling which we refer to as raw democracy), building a group scenario while maintaining fidelity to one's own intentions, conceiving actions to realize the goals of the vision, and offering all of these components for critique to others who are similarly engaged. Throughout, each person bears individual responsibility for his concerns, intentions, and actions and engages in a search for what is shared or can be affirmed. The practices are premised on self-honesty, self-awareness, respect for differences, and a willingness to acknowledge another's motivations and intentions as equally compelling to one's own. These seem to me to be practices of citizenship and democracy, ones which build citizen--and city--capacity.

Is envisioning something other than or larger than policy formulation? It is perhaps a way of constituting ad hoc publics around a shared focus of interest without requiring like-mindedness or a fixed and unwavering identification with a group position. It is perhaps a way of constituting new spaces for political action, without reifying these new spaces and activities. It is perhaps a cultural approach to policy (including but not limited to policies for culture), without delimiting the term. It is perhaps an occasion for persons who might not otherwise have the opportunity to experience their identity as citizens.

It is perhaps a way of strengthening the role of civil society in relation to the state.

If, when we envision, we are doing any or all of these things, then we should not conceive of envisioning as separate from politics, but as a different starting point for politics: an inner, imaginative, intentional starting place of potentiality, newness, and abundance from which we issue forth into the difficult public work of creating together in the present what we desire collectively for the future. Connections between public life, public decision-making, city building, and the arts were drawn by participants in CulturePlan:

> The meaningfulness of public life is important to us, and underlies a yearning to be more involved in public decision making. The arts and artists generate symbols of our lives in their work, and invite us to respond . . . . [W]e see that the arts provide an avenue for relating to our city as a collective entity and participating in its re-creation decision by decision. (CulturePlan, p. 4)

Notes

1 For a multi-voiced description of the CLDP, see the project report available from the Centre for Cultural Management at the University of Waterloo (University of Waterloo, 1995).

2 We have cofacilitated envisioning workshops, codirected envisioning projects, consulted extensively on our separate envisioning endeavours, exchanged our writings about envisioning, and maintained an ongoing conversation about our intentions and learnings with respect to envisioning. This collaboration has been invaluable to me in understanding both the practices of envisioning and the settings in which it might be appropriate.

3 "Changing Purposes of Municipal Cultural Policy" was presented to the Founding Colloquium of the Canadian Cultural Research Network held in Ottawa on June 2-4, 1998, and is published on the CCRN website: www.arts.uwaterloo.ca/ccm/ccrn.

4 The Network Planning Meeting for Arts and the Cities was held on September 28, 1987 in Montreal.

5 Arts and the Cities remained active in sponsoring events

designed to assist in municipal policy development, such as the First Regional Clinic in British Columbia given in Burnaby on May 25, 1991, as a component of The Edmund C. Bovey Series of Municipal Arts Clinics.

6 M. Jean-Louis Roux, co-chair with Keith Spicer of the 1988 meeting in Edmonton and current chair of The Canada Council for the Arts, sees the attention currently being given to the development of cultural policies among Quebec municipalities as a continuation of Les arts et la ville (personal communication, December 8, 1998).

7 This strategy succeeded. City council voted by a margin of one to implement this recommendation of the report and so establish the Edmonton Arts Council for a pilot year. At the end of the year, nearly unanimous endorsement was received from city council for establishing a permanent arts council.

8 Data from the 1991 Canadian Arts Consumer Profile, the 1992 Cultural Labour Force Survey, the Cultural Statistics Program, and the Council for Business and the Arts surveys have been used to support cultural policy development in the absence of specific local data or as a supplement to it.

9 An earlier version of this chapter has been submitted for

publication/accepted for publication/published. See Note 3.

10 For an exploration of the Massey Commission and Canadian nationalist sentiment, see Paul Litt (1992), The muses, the masses and the Massey Commission.

11 For a discussion of limitations to the case for implementation studies as a distinctive branch of policy analysis, see Ham and Hill (1987), The policy process in the modern capitalist state, pp. 95 - 112.

12 A. Murray B. Polson, an artist living in Victoria and a participant in the Cultural Leadership Development Project, coined the phrase "concern-bearers."

13 With Strathcona Baptist Church in Edmonton, the envisioning project extended over twenty-three months, with evening meetings occurring approximately every three weeks.

14 The three persons involved were Alderman Helen Paull, advisory board chair and project chair Terry MacDougall, and I. The same situation materialized in Kitchener where the visionary leadership of councillor Mike Wagner, citizen chair Mike Carty, and staff person Mike Price provided strong support to the Kitchener CulturePlan project.

15 Several Edmontonians who had some experience with the envisioning process assisted with the group work on the second day. These participant-facilitators chose, following the initial individual imaging work, to assist the process rather than to weave their images into the scenarios of Edmonton's cultural future.

16 Just as there was constant provision for new participants to be added, there was an ongoing awareness that people were free to drop out of the project on the basis that true invitations can be refused at any point.

17 The technologically-advanced scenario being constructed by the media literacy team was outside the capacity of most of us to imagine, at least in the language used to describe it.

18 The Telus MultiMedia Trials is a project to develop and deliver multimedia products to households on demand. This pilot is interactive to a limited extent in that consumers can request specific products. Another part of the pilot is to provide high speed Internet access which will be able to carry multimedia products produced by the consumer to other consumers.

19 Old Testament scholar Walter Bruggemmann (1978)

contrasts the role of "kings" with the role of "poets." The former carry out from time to time a careful rearrangement of existing parts, but always with a calculated end in view. Poets, on the other hand, introduce the possibilities of genuine newness, that which has not yet been imagined, and do so without attempting to control the outcome.

20 I first explored this in e-mail conversation with Victoria artist James Lindsay, a participant in the Cultural Leadership Project.

21 I am grateful to Terry MacDougall (personal communication, July 5, 1999) for pointing out the timing and relevance of these factors. The participants in the Cultural Futures Project may have felt the same pessimism about taking action on their visions. Another way of saying this would be to say that our collective hope-quotient was too low, not for imaging different futures, but for enacting them.

References

Arts and the Cities. (n.d.) *Bibliography of precis*. Toronto: Author.

Bailey, R. (1978). *Rapport: The arts, people and municipalities*. Toronto: The Canadian Conference of the Arts.

Bianchini, F. (1993a). Remaking European cities: The role of cultural policies. In Bianchini, F. & Parkinson, M. (Eds.), *Cultural policy and urban regeneration: The West European experience* (pp. 1-20). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bianchini, F. (1993b). Culture, conflict and cities: Issues and prospects for the 1990s. In Bianchini, F. & Parkinson, M. (Eds.), *Cultural policy and urban regeneration: The West European experience* (pp. 199-213). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bianchini, F., Fisher, M., Montgomery, J. & Worpole, K. (Eds.). (1988). *City centres, city cultures: The role of the arts in the revitalisation of towns and cities*. Manchester: Centre Local Economic Strategies.

Brueggemann, W. (1978). The prophetic imagination. Fortress Press.

Canada. (1951). Royal Commission on National Development of the Arts, Letters, and Sciences report. Ottawa: King's Printer.

Canada. (1965). Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Ottawa: Author.

Canada. (1982). Report of the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee. Ottawa: Author.

Canada. (1986). Funding of the arts in Canada to the year 2000: The report of the Task Force on Funding of the Arts. Ottawa: Author.

Canada. (1991). Canadian arts consumer profile. Ottawa: Author.

Canada. (1992). Cultural labour force survey. Ottawa: Author.

Canadian Conference of the Arts. (1989). Municipalities and the arts: Inventory of municipal cultural material in the resource centre of the Canadian Conference of the

Arts. Ottawa: Author.

Cardinal, D. (1998). Changing Purposes of Municipal Cultural Policy. Website: www.arts.uwaterloo.ca/ccm/ccrn. Waterloo: Canadian Cultural Research Network.

Carlsson, L. (1996). Nonhierarchical implementation analysis: An alternative to the methodological mismatch in policy analysis. Journal of Theoretical Politics, 8(4), 527-546.

City of Calgary. (1996). Calgary Civic Arts Policy. Calgary: Author.

City of Edmonton. (1988). Edmonton: A city for the 21st Century--Report of the Cultural Futures Project. Edmonton: Author.

City of Edmonton. (1989a). Cultural Futures Project impact analysis. Edmonton: Corporate Studies Office.

City of Edmonton. (1989b). Summary of the Corporate Review. Edmonton: Author.

City of Edmonton. (1993). Nurturing Neighbourhoods pilot project terms of reference. Edmonton: Author.

City of Edmonton. (1994a). Building creative capital: An investment plan for the arts in Edmonton. Edmonton: Mayor's Task Force on Investment in the Arts.

City of Edmonton. (1994b). Executive Summary. Building creative capital: An investment plan for the arts in Edmonton. Edmonton: Mayor's Task Force on Investment in the Arts.

City of Edmonton. (1996). City Policy Number C211C Community Investment Grants to Organizations and Individuals. Edmonton: Author.

City of Kitchener. (1995a). Terms of reference for Cultureplan study. Kitchener: Author.

City of Kitchener. (1995b). Questions for meetings with consultants. Kitchener: Author.

City of Kitchener. (1996). CulturePlan: A cultural strategic plan for Kitchener. Kitchener: Arts and Culture Advisory Committee.

City of Vancouver. (1993). Toward the creative city. Vancouver: Vancouver Arts Initiative.

Cummings, M. C., Jr. & Katz, R. S. (1987). The patron state: Government and the arts in Europe, North America, and Japan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities. (1991). Survey of municipal expenditures on arts, culture and heritage. Ottawa: Author.

Fernandez, S. (1994). CultureForce final report. Toronto: Toronto Arts Council.

Fraticelli, R. (1994). CultureForce independent assessment. Toronto: Toronto Arts Council.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder.

Geiger, John. (1988, March 15). City pays 25,000 dollars to enhance vision. The Edmonton Journal, p. B1.

Greater Vancouver Regional District. (1997). Arts and culture in Greater Vancouver: Contributing to the livable region. Vancouver: Regional Cultural Steering Committee of the Greater Vancouver Regional District.

Ham, C. & Hill, M. (1987). The policy process in the modern capitalist state. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.

Hendry, T. (1985). Cultural capital: The care and feeding of Toronto's artistic assets. Toronto: Toronto Arts Council.

Hjern, B. & Hull, C. (1982). Implementation research as empirical constitutionalism. In Hjern, B. & Hull, C. (Eds.), Implementation beyond hierarchy, a special issue of European Journal of Political Research.

Hjern, B. & Porter, D. O. (1981). Implementation structures: A new unit of administrative analysis. Organisational Studies, 2.

Julian, E. A. (1992). Cultural equity. Toronto: Toronto Arts Council.

Kostash, M. (1999). Alberta representative's report to Alberta members. Ottawa: Canadian Conference of the Arts.

Litt, P. (1992). The muses, the masses and the Massey Commission. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Magnusson, W. (1996). The search for political space: Globalization, social movements, and the urban political experience. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

McIvor, C., & Elvidge, J. (1987). Municipal arts policies: The proof of the policy pudding is in the eating. Ottawa: Canadian Conference of the Arts.

Melville, Sally. (1995, December 16). Arts enthusiasts help plan Kitchener's cultural future. The Record, p. E10.

Ontario. (1984). Ontario Special Committee for the Arts. Toronto: Author.

Phillips, S. (1991). How Ottawa blends: Shifting government relationships with interest groups. In F. Abele (Ed.), How Ottawa spends: The politics of fragmentation 1991-92 (pp. 183-227). Ottawa: Carlton University Press.

Schafer, D. P. (1989). The character of culture. Markham: Author.

Statistics Canada. (1985). Cultural statistics: Government expenditures on culture in Canada 1981-82. Ottawa: Cultural Statistics Program.

Statistics Canada. (1992). Focus on culture, 4(1). Ottawa: Cultural Statistics Program.

Statistics Canada. (1993). Focus on culture, 5(4). Ottawa: Cultural Statistics Program.

Statistics Canada. (1997). Focus on culture, 9(3). Ottawa: Cultural Statistics Program.

Statistics Canada. (1998). Focus on culture, 10(4). Ottawa: Cultural Statistics Program.

Stevenson, D. (1998). Agendas in place: Urban and cultural planning for cities and regions. Rockhampton, Queensland: Central Queensland University Press.

University of Waterloo. (1995). Cultural leadership inside out: Participants' report of the Cultural Leadership Development Project. Waterloo: Centre for Cultural Management.

Usher, L. (1981). Financing the arts in Alberta. Edmonton: Department of Culture.

Van Meter, D. & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process, a conceptual framework.

Administration and Society, 6(4).

Watkiss, U. (1989, September 29). Memorandum. Edmonton: Author.

Watson, B., Trans. (1968). The complete works of Chuang Tzu. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ziegler, W. (1988). Workbook for the envisioning conference. Edmonton: Cultural Futures Project.

Ziegler, W. (1991). Envisioning the future. Futures (June), 516-527.

Ziegler, W. (1994). Ways of enspiriting: Transformative practices for the twenty-first century. Denver: FIA International LLC.

DONNA CARDINAL
9120 - 64 Avenue Edmonton AB T6E 0H7
Tel: 780-434-2635 Fax: 780-434-3078

Curriculum Vitae

Employment History

1995 - present	**Self-employed Consultant, Cardinal Concepts;** **Senior Associate, The Futures-Invention Assoc.** Completed a variety of envisioning projects with organizations and communities such as Brookstone Performing Arts, Kitchener CulturePlan, Alberta Museums Association, Aboriginal Business Canada, and Alberta Vocational Centre (Calgary).
1983 - present	**Sessional Lecturer, Canadian Studies Programme** University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada Taught one or two third-year courses per year in cultural policy and arts management issues and practices; responsible for course development, teaching, grading, and evaluation.
1992 - 1995	**Project Director, Cultural Leadership Development Project** University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada Provided project management, planning, financial management, personnel management for $1.2 million nation-wide project involving 240 cultural leaders in distance learning innovation.
1985 - 1991	**Director, Arts and Multiculturalism** City of Edmonton Managed programs, budget of $.5 million, and staff of six arts professionals for the municipal government in this city of 600,000; seconded to a citizens' board to manage a cultural policy development process involving 100 citizens with public consultation involving an additional 600 people.
1982 - 1985	**Executive Director, Arts Administration Resource Centre** Managed programs, budget and staff of this non-profit administrative resource centre for up to 36 small arts organizations.

1982 - 1987 **Volunteer Instructor, Board Development Program**
Alberta Culture, Government of Alberta

Originated and piloted curriculum, facilitated workshops for 30+ governing boards of arts and cultural organizations in Canada.

1979 - 1982 **Chair of Arts Administration**
Grant MacEwan Community College, Edmonton

This was a tenured faculty position. Originated this new program, developed curriculum, taught core courses, supervised students on work experience placements with arts companies in Canada and the USA; responsible for program budget, hiring and evaluating faculty, academic counseling; also managed the performance facility, including programming, promotions, staffing, etc.

1977 - 1979 **Publicity Director**
Theatre 3, Edmonton

Responsibility for marketing, promotions and public relations for a professional, not-for-profit theatre company.

1970 - 1976 **Secondary School Teacher,** Drama and English
Vernon School Board, Vernon BC

Responsible for preparing curriculum and teaching resources, for teaching and grading, and for the school's drama program.

Education

M. A. in Canadian Studies in the Department of Political Science, University of Alberta (1999).

B. Ed. (Secondary) from the University of British Columbia (1970); majors in theatre and English.

Areas of Focus

Teaching and Learning; Cultural Leadership; Cultural Policy; Arts Management; Training of Trustees; Building Communities of Learners at a Distance; Working with Volunteers.

Publications

"Culture, Heritage and the Arts" in Urban Policy Issues: Canadian Perspectives, 2nd Edition, edited by Richard A. Loreto and Trevor Price; Oxford University Press, forthcoming.

"From Cultural Concerns to Community Action" in Canadian Theatre Review Number 81; University of Toronto, 1995.

"Teaching the Management of the Arts in Canada" in Practising the Arts in Canada, Canadian Issues Volume XII; Association for Canadian Studies, 1988.

Marion A. Paquet with Rory Ralston and Donna Cardinal, A Handbook for Cultural Trustees; University of Waterloo, 1987

Conference Papers (Recent)

"Changing Purposes of Municipal Cultural Policy," Founding Colloquium of the Canadian Cultural Research Network, Ottawa, Canada; June 1998

"Building Community at a Distance: The Cultural Leadership Development Project," Telecommunities 95 International Community Networking Conference, Victoria, Canada; August 1995

"The Cultural Leadership Development Project," Canadian Association of Distance Education, Vancouver, Canada; May 1994

"The Cultural Leadership Development Project," Conference on Arts Management Education, Paris, France; June 1993 (co-authored; presented by a colleague)

"The Cultural Leadership Development Project," Social Theory, Politics and the Arts Conference of the American Sociological Association, Boston, USA; September, 1993

Community Involvements

Board Member and Secretary, Canadian Cultural Research Network

Board Member, Edmonton Arts Council

Deacon and Moderator (chair) of the Board, Strathcona Baptist Church

Co-Chair, Study Group on Management Development Needs of Publicly Funded Not-for-Profit Arts and Heritage Organizations in Canada, 1986-87, a major national inquiry.

Founding Member of the Board, Canadian Association of Arts Administration Educators

Member of the Editorial Committee, A Handbook for Cultural Trustees, 1988

Volunteer Instructor, Alberta Board Development Program, Edmonton

Board Member, Arts Administration Resource Centre, Edmonton

Committee Member, *SummerFest*, a summers arts celebration, Edmonton

Member, Mayor's Task Force on a Summer Arts Festival, City of Edmonton

Founder and Instructor, Vernon Dance Group

President, Vernon Community Arts Council

Founding Committee Member, *Creative Chaos*, a crafts fair

Professional Affiliations

Associate, Centre for Cultural Management, University of Waterloo

Associate, The Futures-Invention Assoc. International, Denver

Board Member, FIA Centre for Human Spirit, Denver

Member, Association of Cultural Executives (Canada)